

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
OCTOBER, 1895.

ARTICLE I.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP—ITS SPIRIT AND ITS FORMS.

LECTURE ON THE BAUGHER FOUNDATION, DELIVERED MAY 27, 1895, IN THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA.

By J. C. KOLLER, D. D.

The petulant inquiry of the young clergyman whether a lecture on "Christian Worship" in the Gettysburg Seminary were not "carrying coals to Newcastle" finds a reasonable answer in the very nature of the case. A distinction can be drawn between pure liturgiology—as the English say—and the science of

NOTE.—The lecturer is indebted for many helpful suggestions chiefly to the following works; only the names of the authors being referred to in the body of the lecture:

Theodosius Harnack: "Liturgics" in Zöckler's Encyclopaedia of Practical Theology; Kliefoth: "Treatise on Liturgics"; Pressense: "The Ancient World and Christianity"; Dr. John Hall: "The True Worship of God"; Dr. Daniel Merriman: "The Christian Year"; Dr. Theodore Zahn: "The Adoration of Jesus"; Achelis: "Practical Theology"; Beyschlag: "New Testament Theology"; Dr. H. A. Koestlin: "Christian Worship"; Dr. Herman Hering: "Introduction to Liturgical Studies"; Dr. Karl Köhler: "Congregational Worship"; Rev. Ralph Williams: "The Aesthetic Taste of the Day and the Public Worship of the Church"; Canon Luckock: "The Divine Liturgy"; William Durandus: "Symbolism"; Dr. Paul Kleinert: "The New Prussian Agende"; Dr. George Rietschel: "Congregational Worship in Spirit and in Truth"; S. Baring-Gould: "Our Inheritance."

worship in general, since the former implies substantially a discussion alone of the standing forms of the religious cultus, whilst the latter comprehends its universal theory and application.

The importance of this distinction Kliefoth emphasizes as follows: "The church service demands that there be special instruction given in our seminaries on Christian worship, in order that the coming teachers in our congregations may learn direct from the pastorates how to prize and adapt the *Agende* in their future pastoral relations and teach its essential portions in the schools of the Church. Thus there will be cultivated a living tradition from generation to generation in regard to the divine service."

Viewed from this standpoint the interesting theme under discussion belongs to the ministry in the field as well as to the domain of the class room. The form and conduct of worship is not an evolvment of some eminent professor—though men like Spitta and autocrats generally act on that presumption, nor yet is it the result of adverse and destructive criticism—though that is all self-complacent discussion furnishes the Church; it is rather the fruitful outgrowth of the religious life in the congregations—the divinely inspired instinct of the human race which has been brought to a cultured development among all believers in Christ. Its presence is as realistic in the churches as it is in the schools.

There are doubtless those among us who are puzzled at times about a proper attitude toward the changing forms which mark the transitions of this restless age, but when we remember that the history of divine worship reaches back at least to the incipient life of Christianity our uncertainty disappears; when we realize the significance of that unchanging continuity according to which our forefathers worshiped God and under what trials and difficulties, there is a clear suggestion of congregational interest; and when we behold the marvelous development from the small seed to the mighty tree, the question whether we should criticise or adopt the methods of the professional liturgiologists sinks into insignificance aside of the intensely practical interests

involved. It may thus become profitable to discuss "Christian Worship, its Spirit and its Forms" by trying to break through the historian's fetters and reach some lessons from pastoral experience.

THE FOUNDATIONS.

The conditions of this lectureship call for a restatement of the foundations on which Christian worship rests. The standard definition is as follows: "Worship is specifically the reverence and homage which is or ought to be paid to God or a deity—adoration, sacrifice, praise, prayer, thanksgiving or other devotional acts performed in honor of the Supreme Being or a god as part of religion."* Worship is accordingly rooted into the universal consciousness. It is one of the Creator's primeval gifts to the human race, as it is one of the intuitive elements of human association with invisible powers. Lord Bacon believed that "mankind are not simply content with mock-worship but also impose and father it upon him, as if he had chosen or ordained it." Like the thread of gold woven into the costly cloth, sometimes invisible but never entirely absent, this universal evidence of the divine presence among man's intuitions is never totally obscured. In the spiritual outreaches of even the most degraded people the voice of worship is never silenced. At the organization of the Abrahamic church it remained, along with faith, among the religious ideas of the fire-worshippers in Mesopotamia. Perhaps its most pathetic form appears in the ancestor-worship of the ancient savages, which remains to-day the national religion of China. "It springs," as says Pressense, "out of the universal faith of its devotees in the persistence of the human personality beyond the present life." With them terrestrial worship is a repetition of the celestial. "The gods have made the heavenly sacrifice and have taught it to men." It was either a dim yet supernatural adumbration in the soul of the worshiper of honors due a Supreme Being or a prophetic construction, according to his apprehension, of celestial employment. In either case there is the shadowy thought of a re-

*Century Dictionary.

vealed relation between the human and the divine. It is a heathen testimony to the remarkable similarity between the magnificent temple service and that inexpressibly glorious worship of the Apocalypse. Jehovah himself imparted the elementary ideas; then regulated the forms in accordance with the orderly and capable developments from Genesis to Revelation, from the time when men first began to call on the name of the Lord until St. John drew aside the veil and disclosed the grand chorus of ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands. But a comparison between the infinitely exalted worship of the Redeemer and any heathen cultus—the Phœnician, for instance—shows the vast superiority of the simplest Christian forms of devotion over the most advanced in heathendom. Think of the Jewish women worshiping the risen Christ and then of those cultured Grecian matrons offering their oblations at the tomb of Adonis. You compare the silent joy, the exalted purity, the quickened hope, the sublime reverence of the one with the passionate and noisy lamentation, extravagant religious demonstrations, and the vile abandonment of every vestige of nobility to the demands of a naturalistic religion.

Accordingly the foundation of Christian worship is the personality of Jesus Christ, that is to say his glorification resulting in the believer's edification. It is the rightful homage due to the God-man. It needs to be as far away from a mere devotion to a "magnified and Christianized Roman emperor" as it is from the subjective recognition of Jesus as a mere spiritual presence. Our worship is comprehended in the doctrinal statement of the divine-human personality of the Redeemer. The only key which sounds the true music of the worshipping congregation is the adoration of God's son, who is the offspring of the Virgin Mary. "In the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."* Everyone of the New Testament writers adds testimony to this fundamental truth. A prominent Buddhist declares that Buddhism could remain es-

*Phil. 2: 10.

entially what it is even were Buddha to be eliminated from it. But what would Christianity be without Christ? Bengel maintains that *tota religio ad adoratio nem reduci potest*—the whole of religion can be reduced to worship. "We must above all things hold fast to the fact that worship does not originate in itself but springs alone from the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ," says Rietschel of Leipzig. Upon that foundation is the church service established and not upon the psychological needs of the congregation. Whilst therefore Christian worship is not to be considered the bearer of salvation—as a meritorious act in the system of human redemption, we are never to forget that Lutheran principles allow no antagonism between the doctrinal teaching and cultus. Both the teaching and the worship are Christo-centric; they take the Christian-Year as the invaluable medium of ordering and entirely the safest method of keeping the life of the Church—the life of the soul in vital connection with the life of Christ.

The Advent calls for preparation to witness his coming—and that rationally begins the historic teaching. Christmas-tide ushers in the incarnation glory of the divine child and that is the season now almost universally observed as a salient point in Christian truth. Immediately afterwards follows Epiphany—the revelation of the gospel to the Gentiles. The short interval between this manifestation of the Divine light and the forty days' temptation in the wilderness brings us to the Lenten season with its commemoration of the Lord's victory over the archfiend and the believer's self-denying penitence. Thus the Christian Church is to be fitted for the solemnities of Holy Week with the trial, death, burial, resurrection of the blessed Redeemer. Then after forty days' contemplation of truths clustering round the risen Christ comes the Ascension, and Whitsunday closes the first half of the Christian year. Then the solid foundations of the historic religion are finished by setting in place the cornerstone of the orthodox faith on Trinity Sunday. During the second half of the Christian-Year the emphasis rests upon the presentation of those ethical and spiritual sides of our religion which end in Christian duties, privileges and attainments sup-

plemented by the eschatology of the gospel. Thus the Christian-Year fixes attention upon the Master himself, his life and work rather than upon theories about him. It promotes the spirit of reverence, is favorable to the enlargement of thought and sympathy, and is a perpetual object lesson to the young. As Bishop Coxe says: "It is the majestic system of claiming all time for Christ, and filling every day in every year with his name and worship."

Here we are brought face to face with the receptivity and activity of genuine Christian worship—the relation between these two and their distinction. Paul reminded the Galatians that "they who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Faith is the capacity of receiving and faithfulness the power of giving. By faith we take whatever God will give and by faithfulness we give whatever God will take. Some call these two elementary factors the esoteric and the exoteric;* others call them the human and the divine.† Others prefer to insist that they are the *sacramental* and the *sacrificial*;‡ that they specify what God gives in an act of worship and what man gives in return. The terms of the distinction are immaterial; but the contents are emphatic. There is the proclamation of the word of God and the administration of the sacraments on the divine side, and on the human side confession, prayer, praise and thanksgiving. These two factors are distinguished in every orthodox church service from the German Mass of 1526 to the revised Prussian Agende of 1894. In his discussion of the latter before the Pastoral Conference of Saxony, September 20, 1894, Dr. Rietschel calls the two factors *momenta*: first, God's manifestation of himself to the believer, and second, the believer's adoration of God in spirit and in truth. He cites for authority Luther, who, at the dedication of the church in Torgau, declared briefly and classically that nothing else should transpire in this sanctuary than that our dear Lord himself should speak with us through his holy word, and we again should speak with him through praise and prayer." On numerous occasions the great

*Koestlin. †Horn. ‡Harnack.

reformer expresses himself likewise that these two parts are essentially bound together, for in the first—namely, the word and the sacraments—the congregation receives the enrichment of the inner life, which she reciprocates through prayer and thanksgiving. These two elements do not imply imaginary or wished for blessings but the real and substantial. Hence Achelis defines congregational worship as the “intercourse of Christ’s people, as such, with God in what they have received from God through his word and what they give to God through thanksgiving, praise, supplication and offering.” The difference between private and public worship is therefore clearly apparent. In the silent chamber or at the family altar no ecclesiastical dictation or synodical power can circumscribe my individual freedom, but I cease to be an autocrat and become an integral part of the great congregation when I appear before the Lord in his holy temple. Therefore in the sanctuary, preaching and the administration of the holy supper become the two leading points of the service.

Harnack quotes Luther as recognizing the word of God to be the central and all dominating element in the Christian cultus—the situation around which everything crystalizes and from which all emanates. “A Christian must know that there is upon earth no holier thing—*kein grüßeres Heiligthum*—than the word of God.” From the very beginning this has been the essential prerequisite of public worship, and no one would attempt to disparage such an indisputable fact since the sacrament itself is made and blessed and sanctified by it.

But the word is not necessarily its sermonic presentation, as is too often egotistically and erroneously supposed, else a dramatized elevation of the host might be the administration of the Lord’s Supper, and a scientific discussion of modernized novelties might be called preaching the gospel. “Preaching” may be something quite contrary to the word of God, because, as Luther says, it may be utterly devoid of the great proclamation concerning the forgiveness of sin. And, although he insists that where the word of God is not preached it is better that there be no singing or reading or even an assemblage, he points

to the logical conclusion that the central word is pronounced in the absolution and the benediction. The great reformer has perhaps been held responsible for more popular extravagance than his followers should be willing to tolerate. Do they not know that so-called preaching was not one of his beneficent introductions, but giving it the proper tone and its rightful place in the service? In his time there was an abundance of sermons. It was that and the insufferable chanting which so chafed and fretted the noble Princess Palatine who at the court of Louis XIV, had been compelled to renounce her Lutheranism when she became the Duchess of Orleans. It was that very thing which elicited from her such contempt for Romanism and such praise for Martin Luther. Even the grandeur of Bossuet had no attraction for her.*

We might as well admit that the sermon can receive undue exaltation in the worship of God. A well known pastor† of the Church of England asks: "Who is responsible for the unwarranted magnifying of preaching? Who is authority for this talk about 'going to preaching,' about having been 'at preaching service?'" It is not apostolic to make the sermon the one prominent feature and thrust the idea of pure worship into the background." The very first instance of worship recorded in the New Testament is connected with sacrifice and not with preaching. The wise men from the East were not pulpit worshippers." Even so liberal a Presbyterian as Marcus Dods‡ wants to know whether the gospel religion is a thing that must be constantly talked about. Perhaps the Christian might be better for having less preaching. A brilliant Congregational minister believes that nothing is more certain to narrow the religious culture of the congregation than the continual subordination of its worship to the immediate thought or mood of the minister as preacher.§ "Why did you omit the reading of the scripture lesson?" inquired a pious Lutheran layman of the youthful candidate. "There was not time for that and my sermon." "You should have omitted some of your *stuff* and read

*Saint-Amand: Louis XIV., 174.

†Ralph Williams.

‡Exposition of 1 Corinthians, 318.

§*Andover Review*, Vol. X, 523.

a portion of the word of God." In his review of McCries' "Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland," the Rev. Dr. W. G. Blaikie expresses the conviction that the day is surely passed when the one object of church going was to hear the sermon.

* * We would fain hope that the enhanced sense of importance now assigned to the exercises that are more strictly, though not exclusively, parts of divine worship, is due to a higher appreciation of Divine fellowship and of the inestimable blessings that flow from the gracious presence of God in his ordinances. The great theologian Luthardt, so often misquoted, says: "To emphasize the sermon exclusively, leads all too readily to forced demands and unnatural mannerisms which are the death of naturalness and the hinderances to activity, or it cultivates a rhetorical virtuosity and a disgusting worship of the person of the preacher with all the questionable consequences." Says a prominent layman of the Congregational Church: 'More worship; less sermon' as a motto, would express the feeling, not only of many a burdened clergyman, but of his congregation as well." In this change the laity can render more valuable service by sympathetic conference with the pastor. Such differentiation however gives no countenance to sporadic attempts at minimizing the pulpit and magnifying the altar. To adjust the proper relation between the proclamation of God's word and the other portions of the service is of first importance in the exaltation of gospel preaching, sound in the faith, fearless, hopeful—preaching which is the result of study as if there were no divine help and which appears in the pulpit as if it were the spontaneous outburst of the divine inspiration. "If any man speaketh, speaking as it were the oracles of God."*

But the sacrificial must grow out of the sacramental. Here the teaching of the divine revelation is unmistakable. God must first give himself and his salvation. "By the grace of God I am what I am." God must first communicate his blessings to man through the means of grace before man can gratefully recognize his benefactions. He must first treat with man ac-

* 1 Peter 4 : 11.

according to the principles of reconciliation and sanctification before man as reconciled and sanctified can render acceptable service before him. Such is the statement of a very high-church Lutheran,* and the statement is none the less evangelical.

Hence the fundamental conception and the practical application of the Christian cultus differ diametrically between Romanistic and genuinely Protestant tendencies. So Koestlin† maintains and his view is corroborated by all Lutheran expositors. The service in the Roman Catholic Church is made largely what Melancthon very happily pronounces the *videre* at the expense of the *audire*. She makes the sacrificial devotion superior to the sacramental. It is therefore significantly urged by Koestlin: "Let our Evangelical Lutheran worship be not only an *audire* but also a *videre* of our blessed Lord since he speaks to us himself through his holy word and we in turn speak with him through prayer and hymns of praise. In Protestantism the worship of *hearing* comes before that of *seeing*. The attitude of the worshiper is simply spiritual integrity.

There is also a vast distinction to be made between the worship of the Old Testament economy and that of the New.‡ In the temple proper there was no sacrifice as the Christian Church understands it. There was only thanksgiving, supplication, adoration and intercession, and these were distinct from sacrifice. Thus sacrifice was not worship, but only the preparation for worship; until the worshiper was cleansed and reconciled and forgiven in reliance upon his oblations he could not draw near to God. Accordingly the sacrifice with the shedding of blood preceded but did not constitute worship. Such a preparation is no part of the Protestant faith. With Christ's atonement the propitiatory-sacrificial idea was eliminated and the responsive sacrifice instituted. It is claimed that this is the chief element emphasized in the teaching of the Didache. "When Christ had offered one sacrifice for sins he forever sat down on the right hand of God."§ There was no longer a sacrifice *for* sin, but an offering *of* righteousness. To the convert from Ju-

*Kleifoth, †Christian Worship, 144.

‡Baring-Gould, 353. §Heb. 10 : 12.

daism to Christianity this thought of a completed sacrifice by the death of Christ had a significance which we are entirely unable to comprehend. The removal of the vain oblation and the substitution of a simple offertory was a very realistic demonstration of religious liberty. The Hebrew brought his offering to obtain salvation. The Christian makes his offering because salvation has freely been obtained for him. It is easily seen why this offertory should date back to the earliest ages of Christianity, and should have become such a prominent feature of the *Agapae*. Uhlhorn in his "Christian Beneficence in the Early Church" tells us that there was an offering of bread and wine for the commonweal down to the time of Tertullian, when it was changed into a money offering because sometimes there would be a superfluity of perishable gifts, if not gluttony. The Offertory also holds its place in every one of the ancient liturgies, from the primitive in the middle of the second century to the Roman in the fifth and sixth. Although the *Agapae* were displaced by the Eucharist as early as the days of St. John we retain the offertory at present even in the form of bread and wine constructively, though in reality furnished by the deacons.* Hence the language of Irenaeus: "The oblation of the church which the Lord taught to be offered throughout the whole world is accounted a pure sacrifice with God and acceptable to him."† We worship God also with money. As the Kyrie Eleison, which is as old as Christianity itself, coupled with the Confiteor, has been the strongest argument against saint worship; as the Gloria Patri in connection with the Introit has always actualized the Holy Trinity; as the Gloria in Excelsis bound up with the Apostles' Creed has held the Church to her fundamental faith; so the Offertory accompanied by the General Prayer has ever been the culmination of consecration to God—the zenith of the sacrificial element in divine worship.

Here the glory of evangelical Protestantism breaks forth in the religious service—in *dem Gottesdienst*. In our typical order of service the sacramental and the sacrificial interpenetrate and

*The only church in Christendom where the original practice is maintained is the Milan Cathedral.

†Quoted from Luckock.

mutually sustain each other.* According to Kleifoth† the Lutheran service is not a mechanical form but a fundamental principle which differentiates it from every Romanistic tendency whether Zwinglian or Papistical. We may quietly become settled in the firm conviction that there will be no coalition between Lutheranism and Romanism before the fruits of the Reformation have become thoroughly obscured by anti-Christian formalisms. Doctrinally, the Lutheran Church will go to Rome when she repudiates every vestige of Protestantism. Practically, Lutheranism in America will become another name for Romanism when the Vatican is transplanted to Seminary Ridge, and the tiara placed upon the head of our leading theologian.

We believe that Christian worship is nothing else than worship in spirit and in truth.‡ That it is far from a mere silent and contemplative devotion—a simple *Andacht*; that it is not a *prosucha*, or single individual act of prayer, but an actuality of the combined inner human faculties which in outward demonstration alone obtains visible expression. According to our faith it is a worship in spirit—not a *spirituelle* or *geistige* state of the soul—but the human spirit dominated and new-born by the spirit of God, so that, as Luthardt says, "The praying one who worships with the inner nature stands in the spirit of God." Ours is a worship in truth—not a worship truthful in contradistinction to untruthful—but a worship in Christ Jesus, who is the Truth and the Life—thus the exaltation of God's glory through Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost. The foundations of our cultus are as immovable as those of our confession.

THE SPIRIT.

Here then the spirit of Christian worship demands special consideration. It is essentially Christlike in its purposes and Protestant in its manifestations. Unless it stands for freedom and broadmindedness throughout Christendom it is not the exaltation of the Triune God nor an edifying agency in the believing congregation. It must of necessity promote the spirit

*Jacobs: The Lutheran Movement in England. †Vol. 4: 87, 101.

‡Rietschel's argument in the New Prussian Agende.

of liberality, cultivate charity, inspire unity of brotherhood toward all believers in Christ.

The student of devotional literature comes into communion with the hymns and prayers of all ages and nations. If he does not approach his subject under the power of prejudice or sectarian bigotry or with foregone conclusions, he hears the voice of St. Bernard as well as Luther; of Anselm as well as Bunyan; of Wesley as well as Doddridge. The religious songs and prayers of the ages are the strongest bonds of Christian fellowship; they reprove the men who build walls of partition or raise barriers around their pitiable coteries of sectarian bigotry and make the welkin ring with denunciations of symbolism, or, on the other hand, wring their hands over the radicalism and unchurchliness of those who differ from them. God's people will continue to differ about creeds and politics but they all become one when their hearts respond to the divine inspiration and their lips open to prayer and song for the glory of God. *Providing* Christians accord permission to worship God according to the dictates of an enlightened conscience; *providing* they have sufficient grace to allow their fellow-Christian the liberty of which they boast themselves; *providing* they are loyal to the ruling authorities of their denominational preferences; *providing* they worship in the name of Christ instead of some ancestor—there will be liberalism genuine and legitimate. Even the Buddhist Constantine openly proclaimed liberty of worship, concerning which fact Pressense remarks: "If Buddhism had done nothing more it would have covered itself with eternal honor."

The testimony of Christianity placed in contrast with this heathen tolerance brings into clearest light the spirit which the founder of our religion inculcated. That intercessory prayer in the "upper room" when interpreted by the light of so many nationalities assembled at Pentecost, has greatly encouraged the thought of impatience with sectism and bigotry. When the redeemed appear before the throne of glory, "neither Jew nor Greek, bond or free," have any preferred advantage. In the Episcopal Prayer Book you read: "We think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as it thinks best for

setting forth God's glory." The German Reformed desires to be recognized as a liturgical church,* and its conceptions of the requirements of Christian worship have been greatly enlarged, * * but there is no disposition to abridge the liberty which is the privilege of pastors and people." "The Dutch Reformed Church," says Rev. Dr. E. T. Corwin, "has an elaborate liturgy which may be used or not at the option of the minister, except in the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper which are obligatory."† Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson informs us that "the leaders of the General Assembly decline to express any disapproval of liturgic forms, although they agreed in disapproving of their imposition as a fixed order obligatory upon all, and the exclusion of free prayer."‡ The Congregational advocates of enrichment in the service are equally positive in guarding this spirit, as their full discussion of the subject in the *Andover Review* demonstrates.§ The very latest order of worship in the Lutheran Church, namely, the New Prussian Agende, while claiming its authentication from highest synodical authority, recognizes the clergy not as slaves to the situation but ministers of the word and awaits from them an attitude free and untrammelled, "not slavishly submissive nor arbitrarily antagonistic," as Kleinert succinctly expresses it. The English speaking Lutherans in this country are equally broad-minded and tolerant. Nowhere is the spirit of liberality more conspicuously illustrated than in our Common Service. The ardent defenders and enthusiastic advocates of the General Synod find here a splendid opportunity to prove the noble catholicity of English Lutheranism. Our service is surpassed by no book of devotion in its wide range of collects and prayers for the needy, helpless, struggling, tempted, converted and unconverted, friend and foe, high and low, weak and strong, of every conceivable condition of humanity, in the civic, intellectual and religious spheres of life.||

There exists however good reason for emphasizing the radical difference between liberalism and individualism, freedom and license. It is not logical to appeal from the Saviour's proclama-

*American Church History: Vol. 8, 415. †Ibid.: Vol. 8, 206.

‡Ibid.: Vol. 6, 234. §Vols. X, XII, XIV and XVII. ||Buermyer.

tion of liberty, and the Lutheran's repudiation of iron-clad, compulsory forms *to anarchy in the divine services*. Disrespect for the devotional literature of the ages and disobedience to the declarations of the only authorities of the Church to formulate systems of worship, are neither a mark of superior piety nor denominational self respect. Although Luther* cautioned the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in 1526 to not make a binding commandment of his own order of service, the German Mass, he nevertheless urges in 1528 "upon all pious and peaceful pastors who accept the Gospel and adhere to our party to submit in love to the orderly arrangements of the ecclesiastical courts. The life of the congregation demands that liberty be the servant of love, and therefore when its abuse gives offence we are bound to circumscribe its domain."† It is not the governing power in Christianity, that is to say, its ecclesiastical courts, synods and councils, which is narrow and exclusive, but individualism which aims at casting down one throne and setting up another in defiance of the best interests of the Church at large. It is the mother of anarchy and the agent of iconoclasm.

Consequently, the liberalizing spirit of Christianity does not underestimate *taste for the beautiful*. "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" is no less applicable in the modern meeting-house than it was in the magnificent sanctuary of the holy city. But how far is it right to yield to the aesthetic in the conduct of divine services? The intense feeling in regard to the question is a strange exaggeration—as if the element of beauty were a matter of principle instead of expediency—as if an observance of the sentiment involved dangerous compromises with naturalism and made hazardous concessions to idolatry—as if a friendly attitude toward *adiaphora* were falling down and worshipping the golden image. This is an age of aesthetic development and revival of antiquarian and artistic feeling. It enters the realms of architecture, painting, music, sculpture. Denunciation of the spirit is gratuitous. Says the Episcopalian:‡ This sentiment seeks to improve all the accessories of worship,

*Quoted from Koestlin.

†Quoted from Kleinert.

‡Williams, p. 9.

demands better music, more artistic decoration, greater reverence." Says the Congregationalist:* "There should be the fitness, mutual relation of parts, dignity and harmony required by good taste, which is a kind of instinctive intelligence and a delicate insight into the proprieties belonging to the house of God." Says the Scotch Presbyterian:† "If the Psalms have any place in modern worship, then there is nothing in devotional literature which attracts more attention from musicians, artists and men of letters." Even "gruff old Thomas Carlyle" affirms: "Ever must the fine arts be if not religion yet indissolubly united with it as the body to the soul." The testimony of Luthardt is especially important: "Everything about the service ought to be well conducted and smoothly rendered as a matter well understood." "The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him and worship him."‡

There is a growing opinion that we should have the best of everything in our worship, the best music—for the entire development of this divine art was wrought in the churches and connects itself with the worship of God—not the operatic performances of usurping choirs, it is true, but that genuine congregational music which lifts the soul into communion with Christ. True, the noblest temple of God in an evil world is not a structure built of marble by the hand of man and beautified with richest adornments but the pure, regenerate human soul. The following words of a so-called ritualist are very important: "The highest beauty of holiness is seen, not in the stately service with brodered vestments, swinging censers, and all the accessories art can furnish, but in the beauty of a true Christian character. God loves obedience, faith, purity, charity." And yet the beauty of the soul will make itself felt in the beauty of its accessories which it gathers around itself. It is so in our homes. The more we emphasize the beautiful—the more refined the inmates. It ought to be so in our churches. Here the most trifling things assume importance, for nothing can be insignificant which is part of the worship of God's people in

**Andover Review*, Vol. 9, 175. †*Critical Review*, Vol. 7, 263.

‡Psalms 11 : 4.

God's house. At the dedication of a costly and tasteful church the officers carried the collection plates immediately to the vestry and commenced counting the money, whilst the closing services proceeded, including the doxology and the benediction. Probably there was no harm in the clinking coins and the friendly talk which could be heard through the open door leading from the audience room, but surely the practice of humbly presenting the contributions on the altar as an offering to God by the congregation has a beautiful significance and is much more in harmony with the whole idea of divine service. Without controversy all considerations of taste are rendered ineffectual where there is not the spirit of devoutness. The most artistic effects cannot take the place of penitence, adoration, glorification, but these are not impossible where the best taste governs the services. When it is the great purpose of the congregation to promote reverence for God, everything will be made to concentrate upon that purpose—from the invocation to the benediction, the music, the sermon, the offerings.

There remains for consideration the power of Christian worship as a stimulus to religious activity. The spirit of the divine service is not rightly understood where subjectivism weakens into mystic contemplation. The day has never been when true Christianity was content with silent thought and inward meditation. That may be the worship of the closet but not of the sanctuary, of the individual but not of the congregation. The Nirvana of the Hindu is the characteristic mark of selfishness. Spiritual absorption is far from Christian life. "Why stand ye looking into heaven?"* When Newton was "thinking God's thoughts after him" he simultaneously used the most elaborate scientific apparatus, the *media* of his worship were astronomical instruments. The issuance of the worshiping soul is co-operating activity with the divine.

"Shall I bend low and mutter words of care,
Lest he who made the earth and placed us there
Should leave his flock all shepherdless to stray ?

*Acts I : 11.

Ah no! the truest worship does not lie
In fast and vigil; spending dismal days
Only to lift the tribute of a sigh
Gives God no glory. Come with gladsome lays
All ye who truly love the Lord most high;
For perfect prayer is found in perfect praise."

But praise manifests itself whenever possible in an active participation in the divine services. "They worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple blessing God."*

Nor does the true worshiper confine his acclamations to the sanctuary. The working people of the early church sang and chanted the psalms in the house and street and field, so realistic was their sense of divine worship. Thus the praise of God is incorporated into human aspirations and benefactions. Recently there appeared in France a new map on an original principle. Instead of the names of places we have the names of men and women who have accomplished some illustrious deed and added to the enlargement of the national greatness. Christian worship means to accomplish that object in the religious experience. Its power and influence are to be known, not so much for the names of churches and cathedrals or synodical boundaries and denominationalisms, as by the unwearying acclamations of men and women engaged in songs and prayers and offerings by doing living work for Christ. Our old college campus has become rich in the evidences of this magnanimous spirit—the efflorescence of faithful worshipers. There is no need to carve the names on the monuments of their beneficence because it is the fruitage of a worshiping people. Of Christina Rossetti it is said that her life was a song of praise. That form of worship is best and most glorifies God which helps most to the development of a sincere and useful life. The means may seem to be human but the results are divine. Some of the most beneficent operations of divine grace go on invisibly, like the miraculous change of water into wine at Cana. The skeptical, scoffing eye of the spectator may see nothing, but those who work know of the transformations and transmutations.

†Luke 24 : 52

Thus it happens that the psalms as expressive of a true worship became the "historical documents" of the middle ages on account of their influence upon human conduct. They were sung at the baptism of Clovis and Ethelbert and other illustrious converts from paganism. They were employed by the Byzantines as a battle cry against the infidels; they became the martial songs of the Knights Templar for whom even war was an act of worship. Says Marson,* even the fifty-first has been *the* psalm to many of the sternest and most active minded men; for instance, St. Bernard, who heard its cadences as the first prelude of his monastic life, loved it best. Indeed when Dante saw the rows of heavenly saints around God's throne, St. Bernard pointed out Ruth to him as the ancestress of the one who wrote the Miserere. Hardly any holy men died on a deathbed or upon the scaffold or at the stake without breathing out the unknown passion of that great prayer. The spirit of Christian worship, in its noble comprehensiveness, its beautifying culture and stimulating agency, brightens the lives of God's people and fills the world with his glory.

THE FORMS.

It is of interest and importance to consider the burning question of forms in Christian worship—the universal tendency of their introduction among the leading denominations, and their restoration where they had fallen into desuetude. Misconceptions in regard to them vanish in the light of facts.

That they are a necessity does not call for a demonstration. The existence of Christianity itself—its preservation and beneficent activities without forms is as unthinkable as is the temporal existence of the soul without a body. There is order in the domain of grace as well as in the realm of nature. Inner aspirations, emotions, beliefs, devotions become convincing and potent through outward exhibitions. Dr. Paul Kleinert in his exposition of the New Prussian Agende says: "It is certain beyond a doubt that the profound agitations which uproot the depths of our national life demand above all things the energy

*"The Psalms in Action."

of a Christian people who are prepared to devote the ultimate purpose of their lives to the rescue of their brethren. It is also true that the working power of our church is to be awaited and realized through the living proclamation of God's word. But both these truths cannot nullify the third, namely, that the spirit which will and must become efficacious in these personalities and the sacred word is the spirit of association and order; for none can deny that without the channels of settled ordinances in which the currents may gather and deepen even the richest streams of newly awakened life become wild waters and soon expend their forces, leaving nothing but sand."*

Nor does the existence of such necessity raise the question of Ritualism, how far it is safe or expedient and how far it is in harmony with dogmatic teaching. Even less important is it to emphasize the universal fact of forms in the origin of divine worship, in the origin of the altar, of the ritual, its development in the temple service, its preservation in the synagogue, its presence in the early ages of the Church, its recognition by the apostle when he deprecated the possession of the forms of Godliness with the denial of its power. Paul laid no embargo on the forms when he lamented the absence of power. The soul is more important than the body. None the less is it a mark of stupidity to dishonor the body. Without dwelling upon the elaborate arrangements of the temple service and repeating that the synagogue service was only a slight abridgment, we are compelled to admit that even Jesus retained the forms with which the converts from Judaism were so familiar. He paid very little attention to the externalities of worshiping because his followers needed no instruction; only he repeatedly cautioned them against despiritualizing the divinely ordained ritual. There is no hint of an obliteration of forms for the new economy, as Dr. John Hall so forcibly asserts.† Beyschlag in his *New Testament Theology* more than once expresses the opinion that Jesus accepted as far as consistent with his work the current religious conceptions of the day. Even though the great prayer, as Zahn asserts, was entirely new yet the pattern which he gave

*Agenden Entwurf, 15. †Homiletic Review, Vol. 9, 222. Matt. 23:2.

his disciples follows Jewish forms, but in a new relation to God—the relation founded on himself. This principle was to find expression in all praying. Whatever there belonged to human redemption, as foreshadowed in the Old Testament, received a Christian interpretation, altered, fulfilled and inspired. Everything was made to depend on the soul and life of the worshiper. St. Matthew informs us that the Master did not condemn the Pharisees for teaching from Moses' seat, but because they "said and did not."* Here lay the burden of their tremendous hypocrisy.

There is certainly great difficulty in estimating the extent of forms used in the early church because we have no opportunity of observing the gifts of worship in exercise. And yet, that there was liturgical worship in the days of St. Paul may be taken as well nigh a positive certainty; at least we gather as much from a few quotations in his letter to the Corinthians.† It is not impossible that the apostles before they separated to enter their several spheres of missionary labor met and arranged a simple framework, easily remembered, and transmitted it, for the most part orally, since the persecutions would institute search first for the service books in the period before Christianity became the established religion under Constantine. True, it could not be an extensive order since the environments would necessitate brevity and a living personal interest. The worshiper would exhibit the difference between forms and formality; for their certainly is such a difference. The trial and condemnation of Jesus was a monstrous formality, short, cruel and decisive. His baptism was a form, impressive, sublime, celestial. The heathen services on Mt. Carmel were a formality of a few words. The dedication of Solomon's temple was a form remarkable for its length yet notable for its spirituality. Hence every true Christian recognizes the unwisdom of heated controversy about simplicity or elaborateness of forms. Neither call either for advocacy or condemnation. Appeals in the name of simplicity carry with them confidence and fraternity only when they are free from partisanship and uncharitableness. The Church becomes

*Matt. 23 : 2. †Dods: 1 Cor. 313.

tired of men's "attitudinizing" in the garb of conscientiousness. In many places a liturgy might be very innocently substituted in place of wearisome extemporaneous praying and incomprehensible musical performances by the choir. On the other hand, calls for enrichment in worship meet with favor only when characterized by historical knowledge, good taste, and liturgical feeling. When a "fuller service" accomplishes no other purpose than the cloaking of unspirituality the result is palpable enough. But surely the rendering of lip service requires no book, nor is worship any the less heartfelt because there is a printed form. It is, to say the least, unreasonable to ascribe one's disapproval of liturgical or non-liturgical worship to zeal for the truth, when prejudice, hasty judgment or even far inferior motives are the explanation. We know that Paul insists upon solemnity: "Let everything be done decently and in order."* Elsewhere he lays heavy accent upon integrity: "Let all things be done unto edifying."† But it is a gratuitous assumption to cite his letters in proof of so-called simplicity. Although his labors brought him into association largely with oriental emotionalism and its pagantry, yet he would not circumscribe those who sought the glorification of the Father, the adoration of the Son and the exaltation of the Spirit. And Luther also, whose attitude toward unwearying ceremonies was uncompromising but is so often misunderstood in consequence of garbled extracts from his preface to the German Mass, was not opposed to the presence of forms but to the Romanistic conception which rested the salvation of the soul upon them. He simply uttered his warnings against the enslavement of the conscience through them. Hering‡ denies that he ever meditated a change either in the order of salvation or in the order of worship; and Kleinert§ insists that he maintained both the evangelical principle that no form of worship secures salvation for the individual and also the general ecclesiastical tenet that congregational worship is impossible without wisely ordered forms. With this purpose in view he prepared his Latin Mass—not as a burdening of the conscience, but as a rudder against arbitrariness lest separate individuals should

*1 Cor. 14 : 40. †1 Cor. 14 : 26. ‡Hilfsbuch, 130. §Entwurf, 13.

construct their own forms, some with good enough intention, others with unreasoning opposition—*Vorwitz*. He maintained that the conscience of the individual is not restricted by a formulated service.

But the forms, whether simple or elaborate, involve the question of historical and practical usefulness. Among the many theories which history demolishes is the one that liturgical worship is the mother of formalism. History shows conclusively how the displacement of the liturgy in Germany prepared the way for rising rationalism; how the obliterating of all forms which had their origin in the sixteenth century hastened on the triumph of heterodoxy; how in the times of liturgical chaos are sown the seeds whose fruitage is destructive criticism, creed revision, humanism, naturalism, Ritschlianism. It is very significant that the men who push the Lutheran genius into the background, who strike the most important factors from the *Apostolicum*, are the very men who eliminate the objective ordinances and argue loudest about spiritual worship. It cannot be proven that existing liturgies ever invalidated the spirit of worship. It is the arch-fiend of irreverence and unbelief which strangled the outward forms or turned them into an *opus operatum*.

When Mosheim* charges that true piety and virtue were smothered under the enormous burden of ceremonies, he gives the reasons: (1) the ignorance and dishonesty of the clergy (2) the calamities of the times (3) the natural depravity of imperfect mortals, who are more disposed to worship with the eye than with the heart. The warnings of the church fathers were uttered against the pomp and luxury of public worship—the theatrical exhibitions which are possible in non-liturgical churches. Much of the modern rejection of forms savors of the Jewish rejection of Christ. "If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him; and the Romans will come and take away our place and our nation."† Let it be admitted that formalistic services are an abomination to God, but let no one imagine that the cause is of necessity found in the liturgy. A pietistic

*Ecclesiastical History, Cent. V; ch. 4.

†John 11: 48.

leader of the seventeenth century pronounced the baptismal font, the pulpit, the altar, and the confessional chair (or lectern) the four dumb idols in the church. Such zeal against forms might be supposed to argue great spirituality, yet when Duke Earnest the Pious sent out his visitors through the land they reported back "a preaching devoid of the gospel, an encouragement to immorality, the cultivation of carnal security and abominable hypocrisy."* Tholuck tells us in his "Witnesses of Life" that the church forms were shamelessly ignored and despised. The nobility refused to accept them, dealt very cruelly with their subjects, cared nothing for justice and righteousness and set the most shameless example before the people. It seems that denunciation of ritualism is not a proof of high class religion and morality. It is possible to do one's whole duty in antagonizing and castigating "confessionalism and sacramentalism" and yet preserve significant silence in regard to the manifold sins of the day. It is even possible to be anti-liturgical and anti-nomian at the same time. A valuable communion cloth was removed from the altar because upon it were embroidered the letters I. H. S.—*Jesu Hominum Salvator*—and the pious purloiner substituted a note: "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to the weak." He forgot that his liberty might conflict with Exodus 20 : 15.

Probably we may have little sympathy with these so-called liturgical services. Changing forms may fill us with alarm, but in a world of constant transitions the Church cannot escape the influence. At any rate changing forms do not touch the essence of the Church's power. Through all the changing outward order the work remains the same; the spirit which inspires her is the spirit which abides and changes not. Declination from spirituality and decadence from religious efficiency must be accounted for on other grounds. Do the non-liturgical churches usually outnumber in work force, outmeasure in beneficence, outrank in practical piety those who favor forms of worship? Is it true that those who use printed forms are un-

*Kliefoth 5, 221.

able to pray, or that when "the liturgy comes in the prayer-meeting goes out?" What a prospect that were for the fifty millions of Lutherans in the world; for is it not true that the Lutheran has always been a liturgical church? The most prominent liturgical branches of the Christian Church can meet with perfect equanimity the severest criticisms because their methods have proven themselves beneficent in experience. A recent critic of Dean Church's biography admits that even so high a churchman could have the spirit of the Gospel!

Among the so-called non-liturgical churches the restoration of highly treasured forms is a significant reaction from the irrational opposition to the systems of the forefathers. "The impression has been growing everywhere that sufficient attention has not been paid to the devotional part of the public worship." The most noteworthy instance of this reaction is the "Revised Form of Service for the United Presbyterian Church of England and Scotland." An eminent reviewer of this order pays high tribute where it belongs: "Worshiping once in an Episcopal chapel on the continent we were conscious of an accusing thought; we felt that we did not touch the life of our people at so many points nor gather up their wants and aspirations as did that noble liturgy."* In an appeal for the use of the Christian-Year in the Congregational Church, Rev. Dr. Merriman says: "Our inheritance from Puritanism has put us out of sympathy with historic Christianity."† All the prominent denominations voice a similar sentiment; and the force of the argument appears from the significant silence or ridicule of the enemies of liturgical worship.

It may be true that the Romanizing movement in the Church of England has been felt more or less in all denominations—and in itself needs a word of caution—but apart from that, other, broader, nobler, better tendencies are at work. The rapid in-

*Expository Times, Vol. II., 214.

†From the same authority we have the assertion that the soundest New England Puritanism made the essential of being in the kingdom of heaven synonymous with hating the ecclesiastical mother.

crease of educational facilities, the reaction from arbitrariness and unchurchliness, the increasing loyalty and self-respect of the people to their denominational attachments, the manifest movement toward spiritual unity as distinguished from organic unionism, are facts which cannot be answered with a sneer or flippant denial, though that be the fashion of men who evolve history from their inner consciousness.

It remains to inquire whether there would be any advantage in a uniform order of Christian worship. The question cannot be determined by the dogmatizing of individualism because forms for divine service are not made, any more than confessions of faith are made; they grow historically out of the life of the congregation. Nor is there any advantage in the constant reiteration of Germany's theological and ecclesiastical differences; it is a disingenuous waste of energy, for that argument though made with the utmost sincerity tends to prevent unification and the adjusting of differences. It is dishonest to give such factitious importance to things which are indifferent as to keep up a persistent fretting about Romanistic tendencies. If the rationalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries killed the prophets, why should we of the nineteenth build their tombs? Still less pertinent is the objection that doctrinal dissimilarities cannot be clothed in the garments of devotional order; it is everywhere admitted that the liturgy cements the Episcopal Church and binds it to its masterful work. Nor does the priority of the argument lie here. It is certain that there was the strictest uniformity of worship in the Jewish Church—a uniformity ordained of God and conducted according to the finest liturgy in existence—the book of Psalms. And though in the extension of Christianity among the widely differing nationalities there arose a variety of forms—from that of Justin Martyr to the revision of Gregory the Great—they were all the outgrowth of a germinal order as the human race sprang from the one mother of humanity. Neither could this continuity be destroyed by the environments. Although the Jews, who worshiped in the temple and the synagogue, and the Gentiles, who had bowed before the shrines of their manifold deities, flocked

unto the Christian Church, Paul himself deprecated their lack of unity in the adoration of Jesus. He discountenanced anarchy as much as slavery. It has to be remembered that these early congregations were not priest-ridden. The people had a large share in the services. Each member of the church had something to contribute for the edification of the Church. One with a natural aptitude for poetry furnished the Church with her earliest hymns. Another formulated the truth so clearly as to put it into an article of faith. Another came with eager words of exhortation from the missionary field. The entire membership had a living interest in the services. Even though the primitive cultus is not the work of a divine command nor necessarily the dictation of the apostles, nor according to an originally finished order, but subject to the law of development through the operation of the divine Spirit and founded on the prophecies and ordinances of Christ, nevertheless the details are wrought out by human devotion. It is hence a mark of ignorance to denounce as innovations matters which are really restorations. The instincts of Christian life and the results of Christian experience have always evolved an order of divine service, whether plain or ornamental, in which the Saviour's prayer for unity was the keynote. Christianity itself does not delight in holding out the rent garment of the Crucified—that is the work of the factional element in Christianity. Reformers have always battled for uniformity wherever possible—but not revolutionists. It is an amazing misreading of history which sees the breakdown of German evangelicalism in the promotion of uniform liturgical worship.

The latest authority on practical theology, Prof. Hering, of Halle, has no sympathy with the separatistic tendencies of Germany since the Reformation. In deprecating the diversity of forms in the evangelical churches and assigning the reasons, he laments that the pietistic (not pious) movements should divide the honors with rationalism and civic agitations in multiplying the numerous Agende. Yet even these do not differ fundamentally or irreconcilably. What Baring-Gould says of the early liturgies has an almost literal application to the Agende of the

sixteenth century. "By comparing these liturgies together we find that all are as much alike in type and feature as are the races of mankind, each slightly varied, just as each race of man has its specialty and color; but that in spite of such varieties all are organically one." Theodocious Harnack, the accomplished modern authority among conservative liturgists, classifies them as follows and pronounces them unmistakably evangelical; each one, however close its coloring may resemble medievalism, is purified from every vestige of the Romish Mass. All bear the stamp of Luther's German Mass.

1. The Brandenburg tendency, which is strictly loyal to the Lutheran doctrine, but accords the traditional Romanistic forms a more conservative treatment. It is pronouncedly high-church and strictly conservative.

2. The Saxon or pure Lutheran tendency, which remained practically unchanged until the period of the Thirty Years' war and dominated the orders for middle and north Germany. It is representative of the *Formula Missae*.

3. The so-called radical tendency, mediating between Lutheran and Reformed types. Out of this grew the predominating forms for south Germany with slight deviations on account of north German influence. Doubtless there are at least imaginary reasons why these three were not reduced to one; but no sane student of history will admit that the variety promoted the greatness of Protestantism, the glory of God and salvation of man.

It would be an instructive lesson to read the historian's account of Germanic religious life during the reign of this triple movement of Lutheran worship, but the end came all too soon. After the dreadful period of the Thirty Years' war, which left Germany a desert and the people half starved, these orders were almost entirely torn and scattered. It is the period of liturgical chaos. The country had lost all save religion, the leaders of which then proclaimed separate orders for almost every separate state, and although some of them remained true to Lutheran teaching each one received the stamp of narrow state-craft and the character of police domination. As Koestlin observes, hy-

per-orthodoxy ossified and pietism (not piety) emasculated objective Christianity, and both prepared the way for rationalism which mutilated, subverted and obliterated both the form and the contents of Christian worship. The destruction was radical and complete. The ecclesiastical forester's ruthless ax had smitten down the mighty monarchs in whose stead sprang up the puny, stunted growths, utterly devoid of beauty, unsymmetrical, unchurchly, the private efforts of self-appointed tyros, as Harnack says, or orders full of sentimental subjectivity, without any conception of what is Christian or churchly. What a triumph of individualism!

With the political liberation of Germany came the time of liturgical restoration. It is a marvelous fact and mighty source of gratitude that the nondescripts are finding their way into the waste-basket and choice Agende of a devotional renaissance in Wurtemberg, Baden, Saxony, Russia, has cast its Lutheranizing influence even across the oceans. A few of these modern liturgies are worthy of mention:*

First and most elaborate, the Evangelical Lutheran Agende of the Dresdener Conference, elsewhere known as the Bavarian liturgy of 1870 and largely formulated by Dr. Beockh of Munich. Although this is far more elaborate than our Common Service, Harnack pronounces it the ripe fruit of eminent piety and scholarship; and Luthardt gives it the following encomium: "I wish that all theological students might attend such a service, in order that they might receive an impression of the real Lutheran cultus, and with the same, an ideal into their souls that would not permit them to rest until they had realized that ideal as perfectly as their available means and circumstances would permit."

Second and shortest, the Mecklenburg Cationale of 1880 as it is familiarly known. Although a masterly service, scant praise is accorded it in some quarters, likely because Kleifoth is so largely concerned in its formulation.

*The products of individual liturgists, some of which are of great value are intentionally omitted because it seemed proper to specify only such as can claim general ecclesiastical recognition.

Third, the New Prussian Agende, not a revolutionary effort, but based on the former Prussian service. It was entrusted to a very efficient revision committee by synodical authority and finally adopted in September, 1894. Rietschel, Professor of Theology and Chaplain in the University of Leipzig, although not a member of the commission, pronounces it the typical form for united Lutheran Germany; and although cautioning against what Von Zezschwitz calls "cultus idealism" or ultimate perfection in a liturgy, he maintains that the order from the opening to the closing is the genuine worship of God in spirit and in truth according to the evangelical faith. Of course it has its critics, notably among them, Frederick Spitta, the acute and persistent opponent of all Lutheran liturgies. He offers a substitute for which Beyschlag finds no other use than an Agende for the diaspora of foreign countries; and Kleinert accuses the author of misconception of the situation. It is possible for scholarly writers to stumble into the embarrassments and intricacies of partisanism until their utterances are nothing more than the passwords of clannish opposition to providential movements. Spitta's stilted, unnatural, unevangelical attempt is, aside of the Prussian form of worship, as an insignificant Duchy aside of the German Empire.

It is a matter of great surprise that these three leading Agende should not coalesce into one universal liturgy for the Fatherland Lutherans. Bismarck's recent declaration that "Germany can never be divided again" may soon be realized in the Lutheranism of Germany by such a coalescence. With a few unimportant modern additions and modifications, they are each a development of Luther's liturgical genius and are all founded on the Saviour's remarkable formula: "The true worshiper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

The English speaking Lutherans of America have great reason to congratulate themselves in view of the auspicious day which embodied all the vital components of Christian worship in their Common Service. It is an admirable attempt at uniformity and worthy of cordial acceptance. No one claims "cultus idealism" for it but all can welcome the time of unification

under its epoch-making influence and genuine Christian devotion. The testimony of a Lutheran pastor is interesting in this connection. In his visitations especially among the aged and infirm he finds the service a well used and very helpful manual for family worship and private devotion. It is a great stimulus to Bible reading and in the administration of the home communion the communicant having previously studied the service, vividly realizes the power of sacramental grace. Nor does it detract from this testimony to admit that the people are free from the critical spirit which is ever on the outlook for faults, but they are among the humble souls to whom the teachings of Jesus yield their sweetness and light. And although to some of our brothers in the faith this stately service should appear nothing but an empty form and ceremony, and to others it shall seem to open up far reaching vistas of truth and beauty, which lead the soul to God, every friend of Lutheran unity in cultus and doctrine can join in Canon Bright's beautiful prayer:

"Lord bring home the glorious lesson
To their hearts, who strangely deem
That an unmajestic worship
Doth Thy Majesty beseech;
Show them more of Thy dear presence;
Let them, let them come to know
That our King is throned among us,
And His Church is Heaven below.

* * * * *

'Tis to Thee the chant is lifted,
'Tis to Thee the heads are bowed;
Far less deep was Israel's rapture
When the glory filled the cloud:
O, our own true God Incarnate,
What should Christians' ritual be
But a voice to utter somewhat
Of their pride and joy in Thee!"*

*Hymns and other verses, p. 107.

ARTICLE II.

THE CONFESSIONAL HISTORY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

NOTE.

For Evangelical
Lutheran Synod, in
line 3, read Evan-
gelical Lutheran
Church.

It is the purpose of this article to present a comprehensive view of the confessional history of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in the United States. But in order to make such view properly intelligible, it is necessary to exhibit at the outstart the confessional, or rather the confessionless status of two of the most influential district synods prior to, at the time of, and long subsequent to the organization of the General Synod in 1820.

That the Lutheran Church was organized in this country with a distinct confessional consciousness is certain beyond dispute. But just as certain is it that by the beginning of the present century the great majority of the Lutheran ministers of the country had practically ignored the Lutheran confession. Documentary proof of this lies before us. In the constitution of the New York Ministerium of 1803 there is absolutely no mention made either of the Word of God or of any symbolical writing of the Lutheran Church. The name *Lutheran* appears only in the title and on the seal. The very same is the case with the revised constitution of 1816, except that the name *Lutheran* occurs incidentally several times. But there is not a single sentence in either document to indicate what the body believes, holds and teaches.

Under a constitution which still makes no mention either of the Bible, or of any Lutheran symbolical book, the said Ministerium resolved in 1836 to enter the General Synod, but with the proviso "not to recognize all the principles contained in the Constitution for District Synods, and in the discipline of the churches recommended by that body, and that none of the proceedings are binding until acted upon by the Ministerium, and to retain the present constitution of our Ministerium and our

present hymn-book and liturgy." In this liturgy which the Ministerium resolved to retain, there is no reference whatever in the ordination service to any symbolical writing of the Lutheran Church. Candidates are asked if they are satisfied that "the Scriptures contain a full account of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ and of all things necessary for eternal salvation." But it is not told what the Scriptures teach, nor who the Lord Jesus Christ is.

At Harrisburg in 1818 it was resolved by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania to sketch a plan for the closer union of the different Lutheran synods in the United States. In 1819 the Ministerium, assembled in Baltimore, adopted a plan of union, printed copies of which were sent to all the different synods. As the oldest and strongest body in the country bearing the Lutheran name, it was eminently proper that this ministerium should take the lead in any effort to effect union. And certainly it is in this body, organized by Muhlenberg and his co-laborers, that we might expect to find at least some distinct confessional basis. But her constitution of this period is as innocent of any confessional basis as is that of the New York Ministerium. The document contains not one word about the Bible or about any Lutheran confession. The same is true of the Revised Constitution of 1841. Even in 1853 when Dr. C. F. Schaeffer read a report on "The Sense in which this Synod Employs the Expression: *Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*" (Minutes 1853, p. 16), the Ministerium simply resolved to "acknowledge the collective body of the Symbolical Books, as the historical and confessional writings of the Lutheran Church," but *formally* declined to accord them any binding authority as a doctrinal or confessional system. (*Evang. Rev.* V., p. 212.)

Further evidences of the utter destitution of a *distinct* Lutheran consciousness are not wanting:

In the liturgy adopted by the Ministerium at Harrisburg in 1818, the formula for distribution in the Lord's Supper is identical with that of the Reformed. Candidates were ordained to the ministry without making pledge either to the Bible or to the

confession of the Church. Indeed, the confessions and their doctrines had fallen into contempt in the Ministerium. Dr. Endress, of Lancaster, declared that he would rather have both his hands burned off than to subscribe the Form of Concord. The full deity of the Lord Jesus Christ was denied by some of the most prominent members of the body, and time and again did we hear our *Preceptor Theologiae* say that a former pastor of "Old Trinity" in Lancaster was in the habit of exclaiming against the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper as cannibalism.

Such for half a century was the non-confessional and the anti-confessional, the non-Lutheran and the anti-Lutheran position and condition of "The German Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States." Besides, the body which now in 1820 contained considerably more than half the Lutheran ministers in the United States was, and for a long time yet remained, thoroughly unionistic. It is well known that several efforts were made by this body to found an institution of learning which should serve both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. In 1836 the Ministerium resolved "that we feel it our duty to provide as much as possible for a closer union of the churches of our Lord Jesus, and that a perfect union of the Evangelical Lutheran and the Evangelical Reformed Churches might be followed by the most blessed advantages."

The Reformed Synod was to be informed of the intention of the Ministerium, and asked to coöperate. In 1838 the Ministerium considered the advisability of publishing "an evangelical paper common to both churches in our country, the Lutheran and Reformed," and resolved,

"1. That the publication of such a paper is loudly and emphatically demanded by the wants of our Church.

"2. That a paper common to the interests both of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, and sustained by both, is highly desirable," (Minutes, p. 11)—in which action the Ministerium was so deferential as to place "Reformed" before "Lutheran." And that the union was not consummated was not the fault of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

The foregoing sketch, based on documentary evidences, shows

the mind of at least three-fourths of the Lutheran ministers in the United States, when the General Synod was organized in 1820. Hence, it is not surprising to find that in the "Plan of Union" sent out in 1819, and in the first constitution of the General Synod, no mention is made either of the Word of God or of any Lutheran confession. The North Carolina Synod had sent a plan to Baltimore with Rev. G. Shober, who endeavored, in the name of his synod, to secure recognition of the Augsburg Confession in the Plan and in the constitution, but because of the utterly confessionless attitude of the majority, this was impossible.

Hence, the first constitution of the General Synod made no recognition of any Lutheran confessional writing. And as further evidences of the low condition of the Lutheran consciousness, it was resolved at the first meeting under the Constitution (1821) "to compose a catechism in English." Luther's Small Catechism which for nearly three hundred years had been a standard in popular instruction, was completely ignored. The stream could not rise higher than its source.

Thus in every proper sense of the word, the new organization was confessionless, and it was this its confessionless condition which called forth the following criticism from the Tennessee Synod: "The body indeed may call itself Evangelical Lutheran, and yet not be such. The constitution does nowhere say that the Augsburg Confession of Faith, or Luther's Catechism, or the Bible shall be the foundation of the doctrine and discipline of the General Synod."

Fortunately for the Lutheran Church in the United States the New York Ministerium, which took part in the adoption of the constitution at Hagerstown in 1820, did not send delegates again until 1837; and the Pennsylvania Ministerium, whose delegation at Hagerstown outnumbered all others together, withdrew prior to the meeting of 1823, and was not represented again on the floor of the General Synod until 1853; thus giving the Lutheran confessional consciousness, which existed in the North Carolina and Maryland-Virginia Synods, time to grow

and strengthen until the body should become Lutheran in reality as it was in name. Well does Dr. H. E. Jacobs write :

"The General Synod was a protest against the socinianizing tendencies in New York, and the schemes of union with the Reformed in Pennsylvania and with the Episcopalians in North Carolina. It stood for the independent existence of the Lutheran Church in America, and the clear and unequivocal confession of a positive faith. It was not ready yet, as these synods were not ready, to return to the foundations laid by Muhlenberg and his associates, and from which there had been a general recession from twenty-five to thirty years before. Lament defects as we may, the General Synod saved the Church, as it became anglicized, from the calamity of the type of doctrine which, within the New York Ministerium, had been introduced into the English language. It had an outlook that included in its sweep the entire Church in all its interests, as the reports on the state of the Lutheran Church, in the various synods of the country and throughout the world, appended to its minutes, show." (*History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, p. 362.)

A new era of the General Synod's history begins in 1823. Because of the formal withdrawal of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in the Spring of that year, and the non-appearance of delegates from the New York Ministerium after the meeting for organization, the General Synod was now composed of the small synods of North Carolina and Maryland-Virginia, together with the conference out of which grew the Synod of West Pennsylvania. The life of the body hung doubtfully in the balance. But there appeared on the floor for the first time, at the meeting in 1823, a young man of whom it may be said, that, if others gave birth to the General Synod, he nourished and sustained its life. Possessed of high intellectual culture and great organizing talent, of prudence and moderation, he almost literally controlled the body for the next quarter of a century. This young man was the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, who, only the year before, had been ordained by the Maryland-Virginia Synod. And it was at this meeting, and chiefly through this man, that confessional Lutheranism began to show itself in the General Synod.

He it was who wrote the "Address of the General Synod to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States." This is a remarkable document. It exhibits a sweep of vision, a depth of devotion, a power of discrimination, a breadth of knowledge, an earnestness of conviction, such as are rarely found in one not yet twenty-five years old. His general theological position at that time (and also that of the General Synod, now that it was free from the earlier de-Lutheranizing influence of the two ministeriums) may be seen in the following extract from the Address:

"The principle which the General Synod conceives to be taught in Scripture, and would recommend to the Church at large, is this: that we should view with charity, and treat with forbearance, those who have fallen into aberrations of non-fundamental importance either from the faith or the practice of the Bible and the Augsburg Confession; and, on the other hand, that we are bound 'not to eat with a fornicator, or a covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner,' but to 'put away from among us such wicked persons,' and that a man that is an heretic, who denies a fundamental doctrine, a doctrine essential to the Christian scheme, we are in like manner bound, 'after the first and second admonition, to reject.'"

In this address it is noted as a "circumstance of interest and utility" that in "Denmark the *Lutheran* is the established religion, in which the king must profess the Augsburg Confession."

Other evidences of the rise of a distinct Lutheran consciousness are manifest. Among which we may mention, (1) the adoption and recommendation to the synods of the "Formula for Government and Discipline" which had been submitted by the Maryland-Virginia Synod, and which, with scarcely any changes, is in force in the General Synod to-day, and (2) the suppression of the catechism which the preceding General Synod had ordered to be *composed*; (3) the declaration that "this General Synod disclaims the intention to form a union of different denominations"—in which action the General Synod planted herself distinctly against that kind of unionism which

the Pennsylvania Ministerium continued for a quarter of a century to promote.

As further evidence that the General Synod was determined to preserve a distinct Lutheran existence, when a preamble and resolutions were presented in 1834 by Rev. J. G. Morris relative to union with the Reformed, the committee, J. G. Schmucker, J. G. Morris and G. A. Lintner, reported at the next meeting their inability to come to any definite conclusion, and begged to be discharged from further consideration of the subject. And as evidence still further of the true Lutheran spirit which now animated the General Synod, we read in the Minutes of the Maryland-Virginia Synod for 1824, the following declaration: "The unaltered Augsburg Confession is the only confession which this synod receives, or which has been received by our Church in this country; and even the 'Plan Entwurf' expressly stated, section 4, that the General Synod has no power to make any alterations in the doctrines hitherto received in our Church."

We come to the convention of the General Synod of 1825. On the very first day of the meeting the Synod appointed a committee, consisting of Revs. B. Kurtz, J. Herbst, S. S. Schmucker, B. Keller, Messrs. Harry and Hauptman, "to prepare a plan for the establishment of a theological seminary, and that they govern themselves by the instructions which shall be given by this synod." The chairman of this committee was the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, who reported the next morning. The first resolution is as follows:

"That the General Synod will forthwith commence, in the name of the Triune God, and in humble reliance on his aid, the establishment of a theological seminary which shall be exclusively devoted to the glory of our divine Redeemer, Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever. And in this seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures as contained in the Augsburg Confession."

There can be no doubt that the General Synod intended that her future pastors should be instructed in Lutheran theology, and that the Augsburg Confession should be a guide in the in-

struction. In the afternoon of the same day "the synod proceeded to ballot for a professor, when it appeared that the Rev. S. S. Schmucker was elected"—"unanimously, excepting one vote for Rev. Dr. Geissenhainer, Sen., of New York, given by Dr. Danl. Kurtz."

The professor-elect was instructed to prepare a constitution for the proposed seminary. The constitution, which with but few changes is in force still, declares in Art. I., as one of the designs of the institution:

"To provide our Churches with pastors who sincerely believe, and cordially approve of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, as they are fundamentally taught in the Augsburg Confession, and who will therefore teach them in opposition to Deists, Unitarians, Arians, Anti-nomians and all other fundamental errorists."

And that the government of the Institution might not defeat this design, every director was required to declare solemnly that he sincerely approved the design as detailed in Art. I. of the Constitution, and that he would endeavor faithfully to carry its provisions into effect. And to guard the teaching in the seminary, the professor's oath was constructed as follows:

"I solemnly declare, in the presence of God and the directors of this seminary, that I do *ex animo* believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God and the only perfect rule of faith and practice. I believe the Augsburg Confession and the catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God."

When we recall that the Pennsylvania Ministerium was still persisting in its unionistic efforts, and in its desire to establish a seminary in connection with the Reformed, we can appreciate how distinctly Lutheran the General Synod and its theological seminary must have appeared in the eyes of some so-called Lutherans of that day. From venerable men still living we have been told again and again, that for the first twenty years, the chief objection raised against the first professor of theology was that he was too Lutheran. Even the Tennessee Synod, whose zeal for pure doctrine has become very intense, made its doc-

trinal basis in 1828 as follows: "The Augsburg Confession of Faith comprised in twenty-eight articles, as it is extant in the book entitled, 'The Christian Concordia,' is acknowledged and received by this body, because it is a true declaration of the principal doctrines of faith and of church discipline. Neither does it contain anything contrary to the Scriptures."

And as evidence that the General Synod meant that her members should be trained in Lutheran doctrine, she ordered the publication of a translation of Luther's Small Catechism, which was offered by the Rev. S. S. Schmucker and others. This contrasts beautifully with the resolution of 1821, which appointed a committee "to compose a catechism in English."

Thus in less than four years from the time of the removal of the de-Lutheranizing, rationalizing influence of the Pennsylvania Ministerium the General Synod, which had been Lutheran only in name, became such in reality. How the General Synod proceeded to develop and use her distinct Lutheran consciousness we will now proceed to show.

In 1827 the General Synod met in Gettysburg. The committee on hymn-book and liturgy was instructed to "report a constitution for the government of district synods." The report of this committee, written by Prof. S. S. Schmucker, was adopted in 1829. This constitution requires that candidates for ordination shall answer affirmatively to the question: "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?" It is also declared that "the directory for the government of individual congregations, and the constitution for synods and that of the General Synod, are parts of one entire system of Lutheran Church government," and as such the three documents are printed together in the minutes of 1829.

The Augsburg Confession in its doctrinal articles, is now incorporated formally into the system of the General Synod. The form of its incorporation is not all that might be desired, but it stands in marked contrast with the attitude of certain so-called Lutheran synods of the time. And to its Lutheranism of this

period the General Synod joined an ardent piety. The deity and headship of Jesus Christ are strongly emphasized, and that too, as a document lying before us shows, in purposeful opposition to the Socinianism of some in the Pennsylvania and New York Ministeriums. Much stress was laid also on living faith in Christ as the only way of salvation. There was no place for dead orthodoxy in the General Synod.

In 1831 it was resolved to publish "The Lutheran Manual, to contain the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession," and also a translation of Arndt's "Wahres Christenthum." And as proof that the Synod still persisted against unionism, in 1855 it was declared:

"WHEREAS, We believe that the building of union churches has not, in many cases, been productive of Christian union and brotherly love, but rather of strife and contention; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That we earnestly recommend to all our ministers and people to build no more such churches."

The Lutheran consciousness had evidently become strong in the General Synod, for when an attempt was made about 1855 to introduce a revised form of the Augsburg Confession, the result was the increase of confessional consciousness. The General Synod knew itself to be a Lutheran body, and felt that its own faith was best expressed in the Augustana of 1530.

But about the middle of the present century the General Synod entered on a period of controversy. There was contention within the body among its own members, and war was made against the body by those without. The Germans within the General Synod, and especially the Missourians without, insisted that the General Synod in order to be rightly Lutheran, must take a more clearly defined position with respect to the Confessions. In the "Constitution for the Government of District Synods" she had embraced only the doctrinal articles. She had declared that in these "the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct."

This basis was ably defended by the younger Dr. Krauth in a series of articles published in *The Missionary* in 1857, and re-

printed in *The Lutheran and Missionary* in 1864. Dr. Krauth says: "The Augsburg Confession is the symbol of Lutheran catholicity, all other distinctive portions of the Book of Concord are symbols of Lutheran particularity, creeds of Lutheran Churches but not in an indisputable sense of the Lutheran Church. While our Church in this land should study what is local in the Lutheranism of all lands, and learn whatever good there may be in each, she should not feel bound to commit herself to it. The Augsburg Confession then alone of the creeds of the past is of necessity to be taken by her as a standard. Of other standards we do not deny that she may take them, we simply deny that she must. In her requirements of her theological professors she has in fact taken in addition the catechisms of Luther. But the General Synod was bound by the nature of its objects, and of its plan, to make its basis the very broadest which the retention of the essential character of Lutheranism would allow. We are glad therefore that neither the Book of Concord as a whole nor any part of it following the Augsburg Confession, nor any abridgment, or Recension of that great Confession—no not Melancthon's own of 1540, but the Augsburg Confession itself, uncorrupted and unvaried, as it was given to the world by our Confessors in 1530, was the subject of affirmation. She set forth no new creed, she proposed no 'consensus' of different Protestant creeds, nor did she present the ecumenical creeds of Christendom as a sufficient basis. She set forth the Augsburg Confession, and that alone." (*Luth. and Miss.*, Mar. 24, 1864.) He then defends the limitation to the doctrinal articles: First, because the second part of the Augsburg Confession "is not a creed in the proper sense, but simply an account of the abuses in the Romish Church, and a statement of the reasons for rejecting them." Secondly, "because the General Synod thought it needless to enlarge the particular confession which the licensed or ordained minister acknowledged." Thirdly, because in the Constitution of the Seminary, and in the professor's oath, "the subject of specific affirmation was not the doctrinal articles, but the entire Confession." "We are satisfied then with her position in this, that rejecting no part of the

Augsburg Confession, she yet directs the candidate for her ministry specifically to its doctrinal articles." (*Ibidem.*) Dr. Krauth also makes a disquisition on "Substantial Correctness," and declares that "in the qualification of the word 'correct' by the term 'substantially' we are satisfied with the position of the General Synod." (*Luth. and Miss.*, Mar. 31, 1864.) He declares that there are three classes in the General Synod "who would be unprepared to make, or at least to insist on an absolutely unrestricted subscription to the Augsburg Confession." He then says: "The position in effect implied this: 'Brethren may differ as to whether the non-fundamental doctrines, as well as the fundamental doctrines, are correctly stated in the Confession. Let them differ. We make no decision whatever as to that point. Both agree as to *fundamentals*. Therefore fundamentals only shall be the object in this subscription. We affirm of them that they are taught correctly in the Confession. Of the non-fundamentals we affirm nothing, and deny nothing. Neither their reception nor rejection has anything to do with this basis.'" And finally: "It was the best basis possible, under all the circumstances, and we are therefore satisfied with it." (*Ibidem.*)

It was of the General Synod with its doctrinal basis as given above that Dr. Krauth wrote April 30th, 1857, and re-affirmed, March 17th, 1864 (just a few months before he became Professor in the Philadelphia Seminary) the following vindication and eulogy: "The formation of the General Synod was a great act of faith, made as the framers of her Constitution sublimely expressed it, 'in reliance upon God our Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit in the word of God.' The framers of that Constitution should be as dear to us as Lutherans, as the framers of our federal Constitution are to us as Americans.

"When the General Synod became completely organized by the acknowledgment of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession as a standard of faith, it was the only *voluntary* body on earth pretending to embrace a nation as its territory and having a Lutheran name in which the fundamental doctrines of Lutheranism were the basis of union. The General Synod was a

declaration on the part of the Lutheran Church in America that she had no intention of dying or moving—that she liked this western world and meant to live here. And she has lived, and waxed stronger and stronger, and the General Synod has been a mighty agent in sustaining and extending her beneficent work, and is destined to see a future which shall eclipse all her glory in the past. Heaven pity the fate of the man who looks upon the General Synod as having been a curse to the Church, or an efficient worker in it; who imagines that Lutheranism would be stronger if the General Synod were weaker; or that truth would be reared upon the ruins of what she has been patiently laboring for nearly forty years to build. Let a schism take place in her members; let loyalty to the principles she represents be seriously diminished; let the confederation she maintains be broken, and the injury to our Church in this land would be incalculable. It would be to our Church what a separation of the states would be to the Union." (*Lutheran and Missionary*, March 17, 1864.)

But dissatisfaction with the General Synod's doctrinal basis, did not necessarily mean opposition to the General Synod. This dissatisfaction was shared in by some of the truest and best friends of the body. Among these was the Senior Dr. Krauth, who is quoted by his son as declaring in his sermon before the General Synod in 1850: "We object to the liberty allowed in that subscription. * * It is liable to great abuse, * * It is evident that a creed thus presented is no creed, that it is anything or nothing, that its subscription is a solemn farce." (*Luth. and Miss.* April 7, 1864.)* The son apologizes for the father, and declares that "the mode of subscription is not *meant* to give this dangerous latitude," and expresses his own preference by saying: "Let the old formula stand and let it be defined." (*Ibidem.*)

Under discussion the dissatisfaction grew, notwithstanding the masterly defence of the General Synod's basis by Dr. Krauth, Jr., and others. The feeling became widespread that the basis offered a margin on which it was possible to write a great many exceptions. The episode with the Franckians at York in 1864,

*See *Evang. Rev.* Vol. II.

furnished the occasion for making a change which should remove all ambiguity, and make the subject of affirmation more positive and specific. Accordingly the Rev. Dr. Pohlman proposed a change in the Constitution which makes "the Word of God as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word," the confessional basis of the General Synod. This proposition was accepted by the General Synod "in order to set forth more fully its doctrinal basis and with the view of checking the tendency to disintegration amongst us, and uniting us more firmly in fraternal union." (*Minutes*, 1864, p. 40.)

By the regular process required in the Constitution the formula given above became the confessional basis of the General Synod, and of all the district synods connected with it. Subscription to this formula is required of every candidate for ordination to the ministry in the General Synod.

From the very first the action taken at York, and confirmed at Harrisburg four years later, was regarded as a positive and unequivocal affirmation of Lutheranism. The new formula removed the ambiguous word, "substantially" and made the entire Augsburg Confession, and not the doctrinal articles only, the object of affirmation. At the same time the General Synod made a declaration in which it rejected certain "alleged errors in the Augsburg Confession," but this declaration is no part of the Constitution of the General Synod. It is simply a defensive statement,—“an answer to the calumnious, and a corrective of the misunderstandings of mournful years”—to use the language of the Junior Dr. Krauth.

Now analyzing the General Synod's confessional basis, we find that it readily falls into two distinct parts:

First. The Word of God is declared to be "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The words, "only infallible rule," distinguish the Word of God, and give *that* the position of absolute authority. This part of the basis is the *norma normans*.

It determines absolutely the faith and practice of the Church, in the sense that whatever cannot stand the test of the Word of God cannot claim authority over the consciences of men. But this part of the basis is *generic*, and can only mark the Church as *Protestant*. It places the Scripture-principle of Protestantism over against the Church-principle of Romanism,

The second part of the basis is the *norma normata*. It has an authority derived and secondary. It is not described as the "only infallible rule." It is not the *rule* of faith in any proper sense of the term. It is a human conception of the meaning of the *rule*, a human statement and explanation of the "only infallible rule." As such it cannot at all claim the attribute of infallibility. According to a great first principle of Protestantism, it must be led up to the Word of God to be measured and tested. But though secondary and derived as an authority, the second member of the basis is *specific*. It determines the *species ecclesiastica* of the body which adopts it. As its proclamation gave name and historic being to an ecclesiastical body, known as the Lutheran Church, or the Church of the Augsburg Confession, so its formal affirmation and adoption by a body as its own understanding of "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," must make, mark and identify that body as Lutheran, or as a church of the Augsburg Confession. Such affirmation and adoption have been made by the General Synod. *Ergo*.

There can be no question then as to the *species ecclesiastica* to which the General Synod belongs. On the one hand the Augsburg Confession, drawn, as its authors affirm, from the Scripture-principle, repudiates the Church-principle and other errors of Rome, and exhibits what its authors believed to be the plain teaching of the Divine Word. On the other hand the Confession by making the doctrine of justification by faith the centre of the system, and the determining principle for the statement of all doctrines, stands, by way of anticipation, in marked distinction from the entire Calvinistic system; and by affirming that the sacraments are means of grace, it stands in opposition to one of the chief features of the teaching of Zwingli and of all of the present time who are like-minded. Hence, not only

does the General Synod claim the right to use the name *Lutheran*, but, judged by her own record, she holds and teaches that conception of the Christian faith which as noted by friend and foe in ecclesiastical history for three hundred and sixty-five years, has been known as *Lutheranism*. Every professor in her theological seminary, must confess to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, and every candidate for the ministry in the General Synod must pledge himself to her doctrinal basis. *To say that such persons are not Lutheran, and that they do not teach and preach Lutheran doctrine is to insinuate, if not to say, that they are grossly ignorant or reprehensively dishonest.*

If anybody wishes to add to his *personal* confession all the Symbolical Books, and all their particularistic interpretations, the General Synod will neither cast him out nor chide him, but she is not willing that any man shall read all the explanations and interpretations of the said Books into the Augustana, and then say that this confession *so interpreted* constitutes the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. And while standing for the Augsburg Confession, *the entire Augsburg Confession*, the General Synod is nevertheless commanded by her Constitution to "be extremely careful that the consciences of ministers of the Gospel be not burdened with human inventions, laws or devices, and that no one be oppressed by reason of differences of opinion on non-fundamental doctrines."

The reader has before him now the facts relating to the formation of the General Synod's doctrinal basis. These facts exhibit growth from a confessionless to a confessional position. Since 1868 the General Synod has been standing firmly on her present confessional basis. The question must now naturally arise: What does the General Synod mean by her confessional basis? This question can be answered only out of the records of history. The very fact that she attaches herself to the Augsburg Confession is evidence that she means to be *Lutheran*, and the evidence in support of this fact becomes clearer as time advances. Her understanding of herself at Harrisburg in 1868

is unmistakable. In his opening sermon, Dr. Brown, the President, declared: "The General Synod can give no countenance to any man who traduces and decries the teachings of the Augsburg Confession." The *Lutheran Observer*, reporting editorially (Dr. Conrad) the final adoption of the new basis at Harrisburg, says: "So general and decided was the determination to maintain this basis, that no man ventured to propose even a change in its phraseology, and after it was again carefully considered, and clearly explained, all misapprehension of its meaning disappeared, and it was reaffirmed with the most hearty unanimity." (May 29, 1868.) The General Synod's own record says: "When Section 3, of Article II., was adopted, which was done with entire unanimity, by a rising vote, the Synod united in singing the doxology,

'Praise God from whom all blessings flow.' "

Dr. W. M. Baum stated under oath in the Allentown Church Case (1874), p. 239, that the Constitution of the General Synod "holds the General Synod responsible for a full and complete acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession."

Dr. M. Valentine wrote in 1872: "In language at once clear and decisive, it (the General Synod) has placed itself squarely and fully on the great and universal Confession of our Church." (LUTH. QUART. II., p. 127.)

Thus the record of the General Synod, and the affirmations of her leading theologians show beyond question that the General Synod's confessional basis does embrace the entire Augsburg Confession. It no longer mentions "the doctrinal articles," but includes the entire writing known in history as the *Confessio Augustana* of the year 1530. Says Dr. Valentine: "In thus taking as its own the very Confession of both Luther and Melancthon, the Confession in which our Church, from the first till now, has witnessed for Christ and his truth, and maintained her denominational identity, the General Synod has surely not put itself upon any un-Lutheran ground. It is a fact, too, which cannot be denied that this form of subscription to the great Confession, is as rigid and complete as are those by which other churches have asserted, and now maintain their denomina-

tional identity and continuance." (LUTH. QUART. II., p. 127.) "This form of subscription" binds the General Synod to the Augsburg Confession as "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word." In further explanation of "this form of subscription" as it stood in 1864-68 in the mind of the General Synod, and must still stand by historical interpretation, we must pursue the history of the words, "fundamental doctrines" as contained in the records of the General Synod and in the explanations of her standard writers, for these words are so prominent and of such frequent occurrence in the confessional history of the body, that if they be not rightly understood, the very purpose for which the General Synod's basis was established, and the object for which it is maintained will be misunderstood.

1. In the Minutes of 1823 "a fundamental doctrine" is defined as "a doctrine essential to the Christian scheme," and is set off in contrast with "an aberration of non-fundamental importance, either from the faith or practice of the Bible and the Augsburg Confession." In the action (1825) establishing the theological seminary, it was ordered that "in this seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages, the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession." In the first Constitution of the Seminary the Professor's oath read: "I believe the Augsburg Confession and the catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God." As the same hand wrote both the explanation of the words "fundamental doctrine" in 1823, and the two statements of "fundamental doctrines" of 1825, there can be no question as to the sense in which the General Synod used the phrase in the beginning of her history. The affirmation is that the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures are contained in and justly exhibited by the Augsburg Confession. Nothing is *said* about non-fundamental doctrines, but the plain inference is that such do exist, viz., doctrines which do not belong to the *basal* conception of Christianity, and hence such as may be received or rejected with-

out danger to the salvation of the individual, or prejudice to the unity and stability of the Church. That such was actually the understanding of the General Synod is shown by the following extract from the Minutes of 1829, in which, after alluding to the harmony and fraternal love which prevailed in the body, the General Synod declares :

"Amid these circumstances, we rejoice anew in the grand design of the General Synod of our Church. This design is not to produce an absolute uniformity in minor points of doctrine, for we have no reason to believe that this existed even in the primitive Church ; and we are decidedly of the opinion that, while the grand doctrines of the Reformation are absolutely insisted upon, every minister and layman should have full liberty to approach the study of his Bible untrammelled by the shackles of human creeds.

"The General Synod, therefore, only requires of those who are attached to her connection that they hold the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel as taught in the Augsburg Confession, and in all minor points leaves them unrestricted. On the other hand, we are not able to go with those who remove unconditionally all creeds and confessions, because we cannot see how Socinians could be effectually excluded from the Church without them. But we feel well assured that the great majority of creeds in the Christian Church, by entering far too much into minor ramifications of doctrines, and attaching too great importance to subordinate and even doubtful points, have cherished in the most direct manner, and from their very nature must cherish the unhallowed spirit of bigotry and sectarianism. It cannot, we think, be doubted by any one who has paid attention to this subject, that there are in each of the several orthodox denominations, and often in the same individual congregations persons differing from each other as much as their several creeds do. Why then should not all the synods, which bear the name of the immortal Luther, and still retain the cardinal views of that illustrious reformer, be associated together by the very slender bond of our General Synod, though they may not agree in some

points not touching the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession?" (*Minutes*, pp. 15, 16).

Here it will be seen that the "production of absolute uniformity in minor points of doctrine" was not aimed at by the General Synod, and that agreement is demanded in "the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession." From the last clause of the extract we must conclude that the fathers did not regard everything in the Augsburg Confession as fundamental, and that they did not demand the acceptance of each and every one of its contents as a condition of union. The language will bear no other interpretation. There was to be agreement in "the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession." The design was to state the minimum of required agreement, not the maximum of personal belief.

And if such an interpretation should need evidence for confirmation, it finds it in the official sermon preached before the General Synod in 1859 by Dr. Harkey, who asks: "How has the General Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession? How could she adopt it with the hope of uniting the Lutherans in America, and not burden the consciences of any good men among us? I reply, there was only one way possible, and as a matter of course she *must* take that plan. She adopted it as to *fundamentals*, and to these she requires unqualified subscription. Objections have been urged against the expression 'fundamental doctrines,' as meaning one thing in the mouth of one man, and a different thing in the mouth of another, that to some everything is fundamental, and to others only a few points. Now, I cannot reply to this at length, at present, but have only to say in a few word, *that there are fundamental doctrines in Christianity*, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy, knows what they are. Indeed, I feel like sternly rebuking the infidelity which lies concealed beneath this objection, as if Christians had not been able to determine in eighteen hundred years what are the *fundamental*, chief, or great doctrines of their holy religion. Down on all such quibbling!"

As this sermon was published by a unanimous vote of a General Synod, which had among its members Drs. Mann, Kräuth,

and Schaeffer, afterwards professors in the Philadelphia Seminary, it must be accepted as a conservative and approved explanation of the answer to the question: "How has the General Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession?"

2. We may now examine the case as illustrated by the standard writers of the General Synod.

(a) Dr. S. S. Schmucker, who wrote every one of the earlier documents of the General Synod in which the words "fundamental doctrines" occur, and at whose suggestion the Augsburg Confession was formally introduced into these documents, must certainly be an unimpeachable witness of the meaning which the General Synod intended to convey by these words. In his own printed copies of the Minutes of the General Synod, he has with pen and ink underscored the words "fundamental" and "fundamental doctrines," wherever they occur in those official documents. In his "Popular Theology," (edition of 1834) published by authority of the General Synod, in giving the formula of subscription, he writes: "Do you believe that the *fundamental* doctrines?" etc. So, generally, in his writings, and especially in his defence of the doctrinal basis of the General Synod in the *Lutheran Observer* in 1850, where, after referring to the non-confessional attitude of the Lutheran Synods for a quarter of a century before 1820, he makes the following historical statement: "The founders of the General Synod approving the state of doctrine existing among themselves, did not once name the Augsburg Confession in their Constitution, and wherever in subsequent years that Confession was referred to in any of their acts, it was invariably accompanied with a restriction to the *fundamental* doctrines of Scripture." (*Luth. Obs.*, Mar. 1, 1850). This is simply a testimony to a fact, but to support this fact the writer quotes from Dr. Morris' notice of the "Popular Theology:" "We take pleasure in recommending this work to all who desire to see the fundamental doctrines of the Church plainly stated and triumphantly proved."

(b) We turn now to a witness of a different character. Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., grew up in the General Synod under circumstances which gave him every facility to know its history

thoroughly. He differed with Dr. Schmucker in many points of doctrine, and was regarded as much more positively Lutheran than he. From 1857 to 1864 he was looked upon as the protagonist of the General Synod. In both of these years he published a series of articles in exposition and defence of the General Synod's confessional basis. He frequently prints the words *fundamental* and *fundamentals* in italics, thus agreeing with Dr. Schmucker in emphasizing their meaning as *definitive*.

Dr. Krauth says: "We are perfectly satisfied that a synod which bears the 'name, style and title' of Evangelical Lutheran, whose fundamental articles were adopted by deputies of Evangelical Lutheran synods, whose constitution declares that none other than deputies of 'Evangelical Synodical Conventions' shall be its members, a synod which directed the eyes of her ministers to the Augsburg Confession, and of her theological professors to the same great Confession, and the Catechism of Luther as her standards, to confessions, in a word, which are not merely Protestant, but are Evangelical Lutheran, when she used the word 'fundamental' meant by it *that which is relatively so to Evangelical Lutheranism, that which the Augsburg Confession in its very heart and substance assumed to be fundamental to that system of Christianity of which it is the Confession*. Taking then as a correct definition of what are fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, that which is demonstrably to be assumed as such on the acknowledged principles of Evangelical Lutheranism, and of the Augsburg Confession, we want no more. We are satisfied with regard to the General Synod in her declaration as to fundamentals." (Italics those of Dr. Krauth).

Again: "If when the General Synod affirmed that the *fundamentals* were correctly taught, she had declared that or implied that the non-fundamentals were incorrectly taught, no Lutheran who believed that the Augsburg Confession is sound on *all* the doctrinal points it touches, or who believed that none but fundamental doctrines are set forth in the Confession, could have received the Formula. She satisfied herself, therefore, with an affirmative about fundamentals, making neither an affirmation nor a denial in regard to non-fundamentals. She left the synods

in absolute freedom in non-fundamentals, freedom to doubt, to reject or to RECEIVE them."

After stating that there are three or four varieties of thinkers in the General Synod "who would be unprepared to make, or at least to insist on an absolutely unrestricted subscription to the Augsburg Confession," Dr. Krauth says: "Take then these three varieties, or if you will these four out of the General Synod, and who would be left? We have heard terrible things of Symbolism, Sabbatism, Catechism, and Old Lutheranism, but if a division were called for on the question: Shall an absolute reception of the very letter of every part of the Augsburg Confession be the prerequisite to admission into our ministry? there would be upon the one side the General Synod almost as a body, on the other hardly a man. But if the division were again called for on the question: Shall an absolute *rejection* of the very letter of any part of the Augsburg Confession be the pre-requisite to admission into our ministry? we believe the response would be no less decided in the negative.

"The questions and the answers we suppose to be given them, bring before us the problem which the General Synod regarded herself as called to solve, and give us a hint as to what that solution actually was.

"She evidently desired to state the minimum of doctrinal agreement on which ministers could meet without sacrificing the fundamentals of Lutheranism, and to recognize on terms of absolute equality in every respect alike those who did not accept the very letter of the Augsburg Confession on non-fundamentals, and those who did feel themselves constrained by the light of the Scriptures, as they understood them to receive the Confession word for word. It is a transparent confusion of things wholly diverse to represent the fact that the basis of the General Synod *allows* of deviation from some points of the doctrine of the Church as if this were identical with her *demanding* such a deviation; as if she wished to make the *rejection* of some parts of the Confession an absolute test of ministerial recognition, or what would to men with the slightest self-respect or sensibility, be worse, as if she allowed the synods to take action

which would put upon men who received the entire Confession the brand of tolerated error, and leave them in their isolation

‘To peep about
To find themselves dishonorable graves.’

“This seems to be a plain distinction, and yet the neglect of it is, in our judgment, the sole cause of the agitation in our Church—and the full statement of it the sole thing needed to allay that agitation.

“The doctrinal basis of the General Synod, then, was designed to be one on which, without sacrifice of conscience, brethren differing in non-fundamentals might meet. It is a basis, which on the one hand neither by expression nor by implication charges error upon any part of the doctrinal articles of the Confession, but as far as it touches the question at all, expresses or implies the very opposite, a basis, therefore, on which brethren who receive the Confession without reservation, can rest, but which at the same time, on the other hand, defines its position as to what is *fundamental*, leaving entirely untouched the questions whether non-fundamental doctrines are taught in the Confession, and whether, if taught, they are taught in a manner substantially correct. Furthermore, in using the word ‘substantially’ to qualify the term ‘correct,’ in the affirmation as to fundamentals, the General Synod meant not to *decide*, but to *leave untouched* the question whether as to its very letter, the Confession is a correct exhibition of scripture doctrine.” (*Luth. and Miss.*, Mar. 31, 1864).

Dr. Krauth differs from Dr. Schmucker in his discussion of the basis of the General Synod, chiefly in the way of fulness of explanation and in the emphasis which he lays on agreement in *fundamentals*: “Fundamentals only shall be the object in this subscription.” There is no ambiguity in such an affirmation.

But Dr. Krauth grows more specific. In the *Lutheran and Missionary* for April 14, 1864, he writes: “The doctrine of the Eleventh Article, ‘On Confession,’ on the definition which the Augsburg Confession itself gives of what is fundamentally necessary to the unity of the Church, is not fundamental, and never has been so regarded by the Lutheran Church in any part of the

world. On the principle of the formula, as it is a non-fundamental, and therefore not a subject of affirmation, we are at perfect freedom to *receive* or *reject* it.

And again in the No. for April 21, 1864: "It would seem, then, that on twenty doctrinal articles out of twenty-one, of the Confession, there ought to be no difficulty among us, simply as Evangelical Protestants. They are, in their main tenor, fundamental to evangelical Protestantism, and to the Reformation itself, with the exception of Article Eleventh, which is neither fundamental to Protestantism nor to Lutheranism."

Again: "What results have we reached? This, that there is sufficient unity in the General Synod to justify her in defining what, relatively to Evangelical Lutheranism, are 'the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God.' They are, in general, those which are assumed as such in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession—that is, all the doctrines, generically considered, in the twenty-one articles, except the XIth, 'Of Confession.'"

And, finally: "Let brethren who imagine that a revision, or amendment of the Augsburg Confession, by State Synods, or by the General Synod, or by any convention of any sort would remove all difficulties, rest assured that such efforts only increase the evils they attempt to allay. The Augsburg Confession, with liberty in non-fundamentals; the whole Augsburg Confession, will be the basis of union for our Church in this country. If she cannot unite on that she cannot unite on anything. If she cannot unite on that, she will never be united: She is a house divided against herself, and she must fall. If we give up the old foundation and the old life, we must give up the old name. If we cannot be Lutherans, it is time to cease being *called* Lutherans."

It is known of course that the defence of the General Synod's basis by Drs. Schmucker and Krauth, had reference to the formula in existence up to the meeting of 1864. The change proposed at that time sought to remove the ambiguity which resided in the words "taught in a manner substantially correct." For the old formula was substituted the words: "The Augsburg

Confession, as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word." The words "fundamental doctrines" are in both formulae. That is, the words were brought over from the old formula into the new one. This is proof that they were acceptable words. There is not in existence the smallest particle of evidence, that either at York or at Harrisburg the General Synod intended to import any new meaning into these words or to change their well-known content of idea.

1. That they were not intended to diminish the number of doctrines in question, and thus to weaken the scope and effectiveness of the formula, is shown by the fact itself that the phrase: "Fundamental doctrines of the Word of God" in the old formula, was transferred to the new, as: "Fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word." The sense is identical. In the absence of formal affirmation to the contrary, what the words were understood to mean in the old formula, that they must be assumed to mean in the new, and in the minds of Drs. Harkey, Sprecher, Schmucker and Brown, who brought in the final report at Harrisburg, and who knew the historic sense of these words. The ambiguity justly complained of in the old formula, was removed by removing the phrase: "Substantially correct," and by substituting for it the phrase: "Correct exhibition."

2. That they were not intended to extend to every particular of statement in the Confession, is shown by the fact that the General Synod bound herself to be "extremely careful that no one be oppressed by differences of opinion in non-fundamental doctrines," thus as positively affirming the existence of "non-fundamental doctrines" as she did that of "fundamental doctrines." This is but a repetition of her entire history. "Fundamental doctrines" she has always made obligatory on the consciences of her ministers, and a condition of union with herself. The former she has never regarded as obligatory, nor as a condition of union. They belong to the sphere of freedom. She affirms, and that is a matter of *great importance*, that the funda-

mental doctrines are *correctly exhibited* in the Augsburg Confession.

3. The same two-fold position is shown, further, by the determination of the General Synod to protect her members from imputation because of "differences of views on the non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession," as exhibited in resolutions offered by Dr. Ziegler *immediately* after the passage of the resolution proposing a change of basis :

"*Whereas*, This General Synod, in order to set forth more fully its doctrinal basis and with the view of checking the tendency to disintegration among us, and uniting us more firmly in fraternal union, has proposed to the district synods an amendment to its constitution, and

"*Whereas*, We are anxiously desirous of giving the fullest assurance to all our churches of our sincerity in this matter, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That this General Synod most unqualifiedly reprobates and condemns the course, so frequently pursued, of denouncing each other as cold formalists on the one hand, and on the other, as traitors to the Lutheran Church.

"*Resolved*, That this Synod most earnestly recommends to district synods, and urges them to call to account any of its members who may be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of their differences of views on the non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession." (*Minutes*, 1864, p. 40).

Here is the most distinct affirmation of the existence of "non-essential features in the Augsburg Confession." Differences of views on these "features" are not to be the subject of animadversion, nor bars to honorable standing and fraternal union in the General Synod. Dr. Krauth placed his *inprimatur* on these resolutions in language which essentially reaffirms all that he had published only a few weeks before: "We hope Dr. Ziegler's excellent resolutions will be carried out; and that in order to do this that our synods may carefully study what is non-essential, and take care not to confound essentials with it, and that they may protect those who are not cold formalists and not traitors

to our Church from being called so." (*Luth. and Miss.*, May 19, 1864).

Non-essential features never can be regarded as fundamental doctrines. By affirmation of the General Synod there are such in the Augsburg Confession. Hence the General Synod, true to her history, and true to the genius of the Lutheran Church does not intend to bind the very letter, or every accidental statement of the Confession, on the consciences of her members, but to obligate to the *faith* of the Confession and to those doctrines which express the faith embodied in the Lutheran system. All this is made as clear as day-light by her own records. The General Synod by her action (1864-1868) *did* intend to clarify and to strengthen her confessional basis. She *did* intend to remove the ambiguity contained in the words "substantially correct." She *did* intend to declare herself *Lutheran*. But she *did not* intend to force all the "non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession" on the consciences of men, nor did she intend to blot out the traditional Lutheran distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines and thus become *un-Lutheran*. That this *two-fold* position is in harmony with the history of the body, and with the genius of the Lutheran Church, will hardly be disputed by intelligent Lutherans.

In 1866 Dr. J. A. Seiss, still regarding himself a member of the General Synod, and still declaring himself satisfied with her doctrinal basis, wrote: "Our Church has found it good to be lenient with poor erratic humanity. She binds no man unconditionally to minute details of doctrine, or unalterable forms of worship, or specific and invariable measures in the management of pastoral affairs. It is true, she has spoken on all these things. In her best wisdom, and leaning on the inspired word, she advises her children as to what are her views of a complete doctrinal system, of a pure and edifying public service, and of the best means of promoting the interests of the Church. She has her confessions of faith, her liturgies, her catechisms, which she respects and loves, and which she expects all who enter her communion to regard with due honor. But she forces none of them upon her members in the form of rigorous and compulsory laws.

Here and there some particular exceptions may have occurred, and may still exist; but it does not lie in the genius of our Church to enforce her utterances in detail, as if they were indispensable, either to Christianity or herself. She, indeed, demands the reception of every doctrine which enters into the essential life of Christianity, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, set forth in the ancient Catholic creeds, and again so lucidly exhibited in her own great Confession. But as declared by Reinhard and maintained by the most conscientious theologians of our Church: 'Even he who has solemnly adopted and subscribed the symbolical books, is by means bound to adopt every unessential point, every interpretation of a scriptural passage, every argument or opinion which they contain.'" (*Evang. Rev.* XVII., p. 190.)

After quoting the above passage Dr. Brown remarks: "This is precisely the position of the General Synod in regard to the Augsburg Confession; and we presume every member of the General Synod would most cordially endorse these words of Dr. Seiss. If there are any who could not, they belong to the 'particular exceptions' who think Dr. Seiss too catholic and liberal." (*Evang. Rev.* XVIII., p. 133.)

And now bringing together the results yielded by the General Synod's own records, and by the comments and expositions of her standard writers, we will have no difficulty in understanding the confessional basis of the General Synod:

1. The General Synod's confessional basis assigns the priority, the precedence, the position of absolute authority to the Divine Word. This is shown by the words: "Only infallible rule of faith and practice." No tradition of the Church, no human statement of doctrine, can stand on this high plane. There is only one *rule* of faith. Thus the first member of the basis marks the Protestantism of the General Synod. The second member of the basis marks the Lutheranism of the body, inasmuch as it makes an affirmation which includes the entire Augsburg Confession as "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word." Nothing more can be required in order to define the position of the General Synod as *Protestant*

and *Lutheran*. No man can subscribe her doctrinal basis honestly, and be a Romanist, a Calvinist or a Zwinglian. He must be an *evangelical Lutheran*.

2. It stands written in her Constitution and in her solemn deliverances that she does make a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, between essential and non-essential features in the Augsburg Confession. No man can write her confessional history fairly and honestly without making recognition of this fact, for it is inscribed on almost every page of that history, and has formed a part of her life. Yea, this distinction and the principle of its practical application is embodied in her constitution. On the one hand the General Synod acknowledges no man as Protestant who will not heartily subscribe the first member of her doctrinal basis; and no man as Lutheran who will not accept the second member of that basis, or who traduces the teachings or decries the value of the Augsburg Confession. On the other hand she has most solemnly obligated herself not to bind all non-fundamental doctrines, all "non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession" on the consciences of her ministers. More than this ought not to be demanded by him who believes that every phase of the teaching of the Confession, and its every form of statement, is in perfect accord with the Divine Word. More than this ought not to be conceded to him, who, bearing the name Lutheran, still insists on "approaching the study of his Bible untrammelled by the shackles of human creeds."

Well did Dr. Wolf write, after quoting the General Synod's present confessional basis: "By this doctrinal basis imposed on the District Synods as a condition of union with it, and the previous adoption of Luther's Catechism 'without qualification,' and the definition of fundamentals in the Liturgy of 1847, it is the testimony of Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., 'the General Synod's Lutheran soundness is fully vindicated.' 'These testimonials,' he maintained, 'are its real basis, official statements, back of which no man has a right to go.' " (*The Lutherans in America*, p. 365-6.)

And well did Dr. Sprecher write in quoting the same confessional basis: "She (the General Synod) acts in the spirit of the

early Lutheran Reformation, when she distinguishes between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, and requires only the declaration, that it (the Augsburg Confession) 'is a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded on that Wôrd.' She thus appropriates what was *first made practicable by the principle of the Reformation, and preserves an essential trait of early and true Lutheranism.*" (*Groundwork*, p. 35.) Thus may we conclude :

The General Synod *does* require unqualified subscription to *fundamentals* ; or as Dr. Seiss puts it : "Demands the reception of every doctrine which enters into the essential life of Christianity." This she unanimously affirmed through Dr. Harkey's sermon in 1859. And when in 1864 she proposed and in 1868 confirmed her present confessional basis, she retained the old words *fundamental doctrines*, nor gave them any new meaning nor any changed application ; nor has she up to the present time seen fit to alter a word in her confessional basis, nor to give any word in that basis either a wider or a narrowed application. No man then, "not spoiled by his theory or philosophy," who studies the confessional history of the General Synod, and the numerous comments of her standard writers, can fail to understand the doctrinal and confessional position of the body as *generically and catholicly Lutheran*, and as having a full right and a clear title to the name, *Evangelical Lutheran*. To her enemies, and likewise to her members who are liable to be disturbed by the machinations of her enemies, she presents the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and says : This is *our* Confession, the *ONLY distinctive confession which has ever had universal recognition in the Lutheran Church* ; and our way of holding, interpreting and applying it, is in full essential harmony with the principles of Protestantism and with the practice of the vast majority in our Church.

Well might the General Synod adopt as her own the language of Dr. Brown, and say : "The General Synod does receive and has incorporated in her Constitution 'the Augsburg Confession, as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that

Word.' This is all that the most distinguished Lutheran divines have ever considered binding in the Augsburg Confession, and is in the very words of the Ministerium of New York, whose Lutheranism is not questioned by those who now assail General Synod Lutheranism." (*Evang. Rev.*, XVIII, 132.) And in confirmation of what Dr. Brown wrote, she might appeal to the testimony of the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in her own theological seminary: After ridiculing the pretentious claims of certain extreme and exclusive Lutherans—"an infinitesimal fraction over against the vast body of the Church;" after declaring the platform of others who accept "the whole of the Symbolical Books 'in every statement of doctrine in their own true, native, original and only sense'" as "the sense which these give to them;" after stating that Melancthon and Agricola "taught in the same university, preached in the same pulpit, and communed at the same altar;" that "Osiander remained unmolested in the Lutheran Church to the day of his death;" that Calixtus was "neither cast out nor disowned;" that the Pietists were good Lutherans, bringing "a new life into the Church which upon the testimony of even a strict Lutheran like Guericke, compares with the results which followed the complete triumph of the rigid party, after the Form of Concord, as the day compares with the night"—after pointing out these and many other striking antitheses, Dr. Wolf says in his Inaugural: "Thus she (the Lutheran Church) wisely maintained the evangelical position of liberty between papal tyranny and rationalistic license, and became preëminently, and without a rival, the Church of pure doctrine, and at the same time the most tolerant communion of Christendom.

"How abnormal, then, the present condition of the Lutheran Church with her numerous divisions, each more or less hostile to all the others, while during the first two centuries of her existence, with all the bitter contentions of her teachers, the Church remained a unit! How antagonistic to history is that attitude of exclusiveness which bars from the Lord's table and from the pulpit all who will not submit to every particular of doctrinal interpretation, when the Church of our fathers did not

withhold the sacrament from even a fanatic like Jacob Boehme, and suffered an Agricola to preach to her congregations up to the time of his death.

"What a burlesque upon the past of our Church is the position which demands, as the first requisite for fraternal recognition and organic unity, perfect agreement in doctrine! Such agreement was never known in all the glorious ages of our history. In spite of the frequent and persistent efforts towards such an ideal, the life and liberty begotten of a living faith were always too strong to admit of its realization." (QUAR. REV., IV., 441).

ARTICLE III.

CHRIST IN THEOLOGY.*

BY WILLIAM H. DUNBAR, D. D.

In seeking for a secure foundation upon which to rear a structure, it is generally necessary to drive the first stroke of the pick into loose shifting soil, often to dig through shaly rock, sometimes to clear away much rubbish. With this end in view I may ask you to bear with me in a quotation with which I propose to begin this discourse. In his preface to a recent book, one of the most brilliant and fascinating writers of the time, and one who stands for the brightest scholarship of the advanced school of religious thought, lays down this proposition: "We are living in a time of religious ferment. What shall we do? Attempt to keep the new wine in the old bottles? That can only end in destroying the bottles and spilling the wine. Attempt to stop the fermentation? Impossible! And if possible the only result would be to spoil the wine. No! Put the new wine into new bottles, that both may be preserved."

The proposition seems innocent enough. The illustration bears the mint-mark of the divine mind. But let us ask: What is this new wine and what are these new bottles that are to be

* Address delivered at the dedication of the new building of the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., in May, 1895.

so carefully labeled and set in the place of the old? We read on through the charming pages of the book and we come to this question: "How are we to regard the Bible? How are we to regard inspiration and revelation? Are we to think that God has given us a perfect and infallible standard, something complete and perfect from its inception; or are we to think that he has given us a literature, in which the manifestations of his presence and power are unique, but in which they are made through men of like passions as we ourselves are, men who saw truth as in a glass darkly, men who knew in part and prophesied in part? Is the Bible like the Northern Lights, flashing instantly and without premonition upon a world of darkness, and setting all the heavens aglow with its resplendent fire; or is it like the sunrise, silvering first the mountain tops, gradually creeping down the valleys, a progressive light, mingled with, yet gradually vanquishing the darkness, its pathway like that of the righteous man, growing brighter and brighter unto the perfect day?" The question seems legitimate enough. It seems clear enough. He claims it to be fundamental. It is fundamental. It contains the venom of a deadly poison.

The writer's own answer is revealed in the very manner in which he propounds the question. It is so speciously put as to betray us into fundamental error. The foundation principle laid down as the ground-work of Protestant Theology was this: The Word of God, the Canonical Scriptures, the absolute and only rule of faith and life. We have been taught to look upon the fundamental doctrines of scripture as fixed, immovable, permanent—the revelations of scripture as complete, perfect, final. The closing utterance of God's word comes to us as the seal at once of its origin and of its completeness: "If any many shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." With an utter disregard for the most sacred of all sacred things the question breaks this seal. The reformers of the sixteenth century repudiated the idea of an infallible Church, appealing from a fallible Church to the infallible word of God. The so-called reformers of this nineteenth cen-

tury would repudiate the fundamental fact of the infallible word of God, appealing from the infallible word to reason, a guess, nothing. The new wine is a reconstructed faith; the new bottles are reconstructed theological statements and a reconstructed Bible.

We may dismiss this solitary writer and his book with a passing notice. The movement which he represents is not to be despised. It is a movement which is sweeping in its wake some of the brightest scholarship of this generation. Its dangerous poison is being scattered throughout our churches. It "is the highest wave of a general critical movement caused by a vast breaking up of the waters of human thought, through the introduction of certain modern principles. The flow of this tidal wave of criticism is equally strong, and has been felt with equal keenness, in the secular realms of literature and history, in philosophy, in sociology and political economy, and even in the ordinary avenues of practical business life. * * It has at last reached the doors of the loftiest and most sacred citadel of Christendom, and is rushing through its portals."

It is with emotions of natural and reasonable pride, and at the same time of devout thanksgiving, that I take this place to-day. For in taking it I feel that I have the honor of standing for an institution which sets its face like flint against the new wine in new bottles, which rests firmly upon the unshaken foundations of the infallible word of God. There is no "Whither" written upon the front of this new building. Upon a theology so grounded there rests a responsibility in these times such as it has perhaps not been called upon to assume since the days of the Reformation. To a theology so grounded the Church and Christendom look, must look, has the right to look, to act, not only passively in defence of the truth, but aggressively in assault upon the error, to probe the secret of power of the movements of the day, to uncover the fallacy of the specious arguments, to discriminate between the error and the truth so cunningly mixed, to smite the error hip and thigh.

To meet this demand needs, not a reconstructed theology, but if you will allow me the term, a revitalized theology—a theolo-

gy readjusted in its relation to religious thought and Christ. To this end I may state as my general theme "*Christ in Theology.*"

I. THE PLACE OF THEOLOGY IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

Henry Wace, in "Bampton Lectures," has concisely put and sharply analyzed a tendency which we have all felt to throw discredit on theology. "It is of course a commonplace to assert that there can be no real collision between the truths of religion and those of physical science; and it is equally a commonplace that there can be no real incompatibility between the scientific spirit and the spirit of faith." But at this moment we are confronted by a peculiar situation, yet one that has a natural explanation. Nothing is so evident to the thoughtful student as what may be called a lack of balance in the development of human thought. "As one principle after another comes into prominence, as one faculty after another of man's nature asserts itself, it overbears all others for a time." This general fact will help us to understand and at the same time aid us to meet the peculiar situation of this time. At this moment the scientific spirit is prominent, dominates in the realm of thought. Science, to use a familiar phrase, is "in the air." We have all due respect for the scientific spirit. "The most brilliant achievements of our century have been its scientific advances." But in the undue prominence given to habits of scientific thought and in the dominating tendency to judge of all things on purely scientific grounds, a disproportion has been created reflecting on other departments of human thought—especially on theological thought. Two results are manifest so far as modern theology is concerned. The one is the tendency to *minimize theology*—"a disposition to reduce to the smallest possible limits that which is essential in Christianity"—to reduce every doctrine of revelation within the limits of natural knowledge. The other is—a tendency more dangerous in that it touches practical life—the disposition to make the practical religion of the church purely *moral and entirely independent of theology*. It was M. Renan who declared: "We should seek in vain for a theological proposition in the gospel." A recent statement has been made "that the earliest

teachings of Jesus recorded in the gospel which can be regarded as in any degree historical is pure morality, almost if not quite free from theological dogmas. Morality was the essence of his system; theology was an afterthought." The popular mind somehow responds to these statements. Even to the minds of a large multitude of Christians there is a flavor of plausibility about them. And so it has come to pass that the demand is not an unusual one of the preacher, "Give us practical religion—not doctrine—not theology."

Confronted by this situation there is at this moment a claim upon theology such as has not been perhaps since the days of the Reformation. We are not alarmed by the situation. By and by the proper balance will assert itself. But in the meantime the theological spirit must assert itself over against the scientific spirit—not indeed to place itself in conflict—but to maintain the proper balance in religious thought.

Theology has always held a preëminent place *in human thought*. It would be difficult indeed for the student of history to name an influence which has been stronger in any age in formulating the thought of that age than the attempt to solve the problem of God—his existence—his relation to the world—man's relation to him. A study of history reveals the fact that in every century the measure of earnestness in considering this problem has decided the measure of intellectual activity. That problem is the starting-point of all theology. It is infinitely beyond the ken of the scientific spirit. And so it has come to pass that always the schools of theological inquiry have been the fountain-heads of thought in every civilized nation and time. Taylor Lewis says: "Faith is the life of science. In some form it always precedes. Every revival of literature in the world, every new interest in philosophy, every notable quickening of the human intelligence, may be traced to something that may be called a revival of religion." "Not without historical warrant does Kaulbach, in his Cartoon of the Reformation, group all the intellectual activity of the seventeenth century around Luther with his open Bible in his hand."

The place of theology *in religion* is fundamental. The error

is fatal which separates the two. There is a great hue and cry against creeds. "Creeds," men say, "why they are only religious opinions and theories." Creeds! why they are looked upon as representing narrowness and bigotry and prejudice and as antagonistic to all that is liberal and broad and progressive. Creeds! why they are regarded as the embodiment of everything that is impracticable and worthless in religion. More than one half that join in this cry do not know what creeds are. Creeds are not mere religious theories and speculations. They are the embodiment of the teaching of this Book of books. They are the theological statements of the doctrines of this Bible. These doctrines stand at the very center of the religion of Christianity. You cannot conceive of a system of religion but what certain great truths are at the centre of it. It has been so with all the great religions of the world. Take away their beliefs with reference to God and their religion is gone. And this is especially and manifestly true of the religion of this Bible. Go back to the beginning, the very first we hear of religion is as it comes to us in the revelations from heaven. Crowd out these doctrines and your Christianity is gone. These doctrines are the foundations of all true Christian life. This statement is not difficult to understand. There is a natural affinity between all kinds of truth and all forms of goodness. The man that holds no truth can not be good and true. The gospel is *like a bridge* by which alone men can go from this valley of shadows to the regions of bliss and happiness. Every doctrine is an arch and all the arches of doctrine united make up the bridge. Leave out one arch and the bridge is defective, and nothing is more dangerous than a defective bridge. The gospel is *like a ladder* by which we climb to heaven. Every doctrine is a round in the ladder and by these rounds we climb. Leave out one round and it stops the course to heaven. The truths of the gospel are like stepping-stones over a deep water. Take away one stone and you leave an impassable breach. Some day we will understand better than we do to-day how much theology, with its concise, systematic formulated statements of doctrine has had to do with the spread of the gospel, with the more intelligent experiences

of Christians, and with the more intense, methodical and efficient activity of the Church.

And so as a matter of course it follows that theology must hold a preëminent place in *religious thought*. Take if you please, what may be regarded as the two fundamental principles of Christ's system: "Love to God and Love to Man." It is high above the scientific test of thought as heaven is high above earth. It is matter of pure theology. "It is the very theological problem which has racked the heart and brain of man from the dawn of religious thought to the present moment." Or take if you please a single passage. "There is one short passage which has asserted its hold over the minds of men, whatever their critical opinions, as embodying essentially the thoughts of our Lord. That passage is the Lord's Prayer. No one probably would dispute that in that brief form of words we possess the very substance of the mind of Christ. But in the mere conception of prayer it involves the whole principle of our personal relation to God." That principle the scientific spirit can not touch. It is above all the most presumptuous reaches of the higher criticism. It is pure theology. And so passage after passage exhibits the perversity of all attempts to deprive our Lord's teaching of its theological element. Close your schools of theology and there will be confusion worse confounded in the realm of religious thought.

Holding this preëminent place in the world of thought and especially in the world of religious thought, it is to theology that we must look to counteract the tendencies of the day. It must assert itself to secure the proper balance.

To this end our religious teachers *need a theological equipment as never before*. There are three purposes towards which attempts "to confirm and establish Christian faith may be directed." The one is to show the inconsistency of error; this is mainly polemical. The second is to show that the truths and facts it reveals are consistent with reason and science; this is mainly apologetical. The third is to assert the positive grounds on which our faith rests and to enforce it. This is properly the field of theology. This latter it seems to us is the purpose

which once more must engage the consecrated thought and the ransomed powers of the servants of the Most High. The Christian teacher must be prepared to unveil the secret fallacy of the subtle errors—must be prepared to show the consistency of theological truth with reason and science—but most of all must he be ready to confront error with a clear statement of the positive grounds on which the faith of the Church rests. For either purpose the demand of the day is for Christian teachers well equipped. Superficial thinkers and men lacking in careful and thorough theological training are unsafe men in our pulpits.

And equally important is it that theology *should concentrate its forces* in its legitimate field and against the common foe. This is true in this day as perhaps never before since the Reformation. The conflict of the age, so far as the Church is concerned, is first of all theological. Other controversies are secondary. On questions of forms and politics and methods we may differ without essential injury. On the great fundamental questions of theology we must join hands in mutual fraternal fellowship and love, to present an unbroken front to the common foe. Here and now, before this magnificent hall to be consecrated to its high and holy purposes, amidst the precious memories which gather about us, in the presence of him who is the great Head of the Church, we may record our grateful thanksgiving, that, whatever our differences on minor questions, on all matters of fundamental doctrine we are essentially one. And here to-day my heart prompts me to a most earnest appeal: Let us bury our differences on non-essentials and on all matters of secondary import, and standing upon the word of God and the Augsburg Confession as the correct exhibition of the truths of that word, let us join hands in the fraternity of sound doctrine and against the common foe.

And now let me add that the demand of the day is for a revitalized theology. This is necessary that it may reassert itself. I say this not to reflect on the theology of the time. But it can not be ignored that the natural tendency of theological thought is to formalism. Its very object to systematize thought brings with it this tendency. The age demands, not a reconstructed

theology, but what I have called a re-vitalized theology. And more and more in all the circles of religious thought it is felt that the secret of this re-vitalizing of theology is contained in giving Christ his proper place. And so I am led to consider,

II. THE PLACE OF CHRIST IN THEOLOGY.

"Christ the centre of theology" has become a pet phrase in these times. We hear it in various quarters. This fact makes it all the more important that we should ask: What is the Christ who is to be the centre of theology? In what sense is he to be the centre of theology? Often it is the mere historic, human Christ. Just as often it is only an ideal Christ. And quite frequently it is a vague, indefinite Christ, without any distinct personality. Let it be clearly fixed in mind then that the Christ who is to be the centre of modern theology, must be the Christ of scripture; and that he must be the centre of theology in the same sense in which he is the centre of the doctrines of scripture.

It is a truth so evident that it needs no proof, so often stated as to have become almost a commonplace, that Christ is the centre of Christianity. And yet frequently as the statement is made it is a grave question whether religious thought has begun to fathom the profound depth of the truth. It is understood, of course, that the story of Christ and the events of his life form the central point around which the Bible history revolves. But it is to be understood more clearly than it now is, or perhaps ever yet has been, that it is not simply the historic Christ that is the essential centre of Christianity, but the divine, living Christ. And it is to be understood that Christ is not simply the centre of Christian history, but essentially of Christian experience. Paul's Christian experience began with his appropriating the work of the historic Christ,—Christ and him crucified. But nothing is more manifest than that Paul's conscious religious experience did not simply revolve around the Man of Nazareth. Its secret of abiding strength was the divine, living Christ. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And still more profoundly is it true, that Christ is the essential centre of all Chris-

tian truth and doctrine. The doctrines of Christianity do not rest upon a dead past. If so they would long ago have perished in the oblivion of that past, or be as musty and mouldy as the worthless abstractions of the Koran or Vedas. The doctrines of Christianity are not simply dead treasures of the past; they throb and pulsate with a life that makes them as vital to-day as when first uttered. The doctrines are "of Christ." Christ, the divine living Christ, is the soul and centre.

And the place which Christ occupies in Christianity, is the place which he must occupy in Christian training and culture. "The ultimate answer to all questions, the solution of all doubts, is contained in Him who is the mystery of all mysteries, the revelation all revelations, that is, in Christ the light of the world." Christlieb's earnest cry rings out to-day with just as thrilling force as it did twenty years ago: "Between Christless culture and Christianity, a bridge of accommodation can no more be built than between light and darkness." And the Christian culture of the times can not rest simply upon the human life and teachings of the man Christ Jesus; it must be vital with the conscious and recognized presence of the spirit of Christ—the divine Christ—the living Christ. "Only let the Church hold fast him who is her foundation and end, Christ; only let her proclaim him, not with the old merely but with new tongues:" let her be mindful to present him to the present age, feverishly agitated, and in every sphere of knowledge and action wearily excited, and the triumph of the truth may be confidently anticipated. To this end we must look to theology to guide the religious thought and speculations of the day. To this end we need a theology that is a system, but more than a system,—a theology vitalized by giving Christ his proper place in its system and in its forms of statement.

Now the place which Christ must occupy in theology is that which he holds in Christianity, and most essentially that which he occupies in Christian doctrine. For theology proper is not a statement of Christian history, nor yet a statement of Christian experience, but a statement of Christian doctrine. So what

Christ is in Christian doctrine, that he must be in Christian theology. Our worship must be Christo-centric, our methods of church-work must be Christo-centric, but most of all must our theology be Christo-centric. Otherwise theology is but the dry rattling shell out of which the kernel has dropped, the pithless husk out of which the living seed has fallen, the rusty and rusting armor of a living form whose pulse has long ago ceased to beat.

At the centre of this system must of course be recognized the historic Christ. The life lived, the acts performed, the words uttered, the sufferings endured, the death submitted to eighteen hundred years ago dare not be ignored. It is a fact evident to every careful student and one that ought to inspire every earnest Christian that the tendency of modern theology is to concentrate thought more and more on Christ. Fairburn calls attention to this and says: "What a contrast does the workshop of a living theologian present to the library of the older divines! Dogmatics and apologetics have almost disappeared from it, and in their place stand books on almost every possible question in the textual, literary, and historical criticism of the Old and New Testaments. Harmonies have almost ceased to be, and instead we have discussions on the sources, sequence, dependence, independence, purpose, dates of the four gospels." Biblical criticism has assumed a new significance and a new importance. There is an intensity in this study that is striking, almost startling. "The libraries of Europe and even the monasteries of the East have been ransacked for manuscripts, and the manuscripts themselves have been collated and compared with an enthusiasm and a painstaking far greater than that bestowed on any secular writers of equal antiquity. The writings have been subjected to a minute and even microscopic critical examination, and a more comprehensive study of their general tenor has not been neglected." We stand before the marvelous activity in this field in amazement. What is the meaning of it all? Study it carefully and you cannot fail to perceive that most important of all is the concentrated attention which is directed to the life and character of Christ. Lives of Christ have been written by men of all

schools, tendencies, churches, each using some more or less rigorous critical method. And other writers are at work on the same theme as if it could never be exhausted. Besides these, and supplementary to them, are histories of the New Testament times, which show us the smaller eddies as well as the greater movements, and all of them evidently only to supply the background, and the light and shade needed to throw the central figure into true perspective. Once more, and perhaps as never before, the question is being asked, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" This is the centre of the greatest intellectual agitation of the age.

Now all this is well. But all this is not enough. We are bound to discriminate carefully between this concentrating of intellectual activity in the historic Christ, and the devout centering of thought in the living divine Christ. The deadest ritualism may be Christo-centric,—but only so in making the historic Christ the centre of its observances. In a certain sense the theology of the Romish Church, as its worship and church life, is Christo-centric. There is scarcely another church more so. For ten centuries it has kept alive the memories of the events in the life of Christ. But it is only the historic Christ,—the dead Christ. The Unitarian might claim his theology to be Christo-centric. His teachings of morality are based on the life of Christ as no other. But it is only the historic Christ. The Higher Criticism might claim to be Christo-centric in its intellectual activity. Christ is the centre of its most earnest thought. But it is the historic Christ. The Christian theology of the day must place itself in a position to compete with the higher criticism in its study of the life of the historic Christ. Yea, more,—Christian theology must dominate in this realm of intellectual activity. We must look to it to formulate the results. To accomplish this it must go to the study with a vigor that is more than mere enthusiasm,—more than mere intellectual force. It must be Christo-centric in a sense in which the Romish theology is not, the Unitarian can not be, and the higher criticism could not presume to be. Christ must be the centre of its life,—the living divine Christ its heart,—making its

systematic statements throb and quiver with spiritual life and power. A spiritually dead intellect will achieve no more for Christ than a spiritually dead soul. A spiritually dead theology will achieve no more for the truth as it is in Jesus than a spiritually dead church. As well place an array of empty armors of steel without living forms in them to meet the onslaught of the living foe as to confront the present attack upon our faith, quivering with a strong pulse of intellectual life, with a theology that has no living Christ in it.

We have come to have a new conception of God in his relation to creation. We think of him "not as some one outside of his creation ruling *over* it, but as some one inside his creation ruling *within* it. God is not a mechanic who has built an engine and stands in the locomotive and holds the lever, turning off or on the steam, and regulating the machine as he will; but God is a spirit, and as a spirit indwelling in all that he has made." What God is to his creation that Christ is to Christian truth. "The organist sits at the instrument and plays upon it. He is not the organ. He ministers it, directs it, controls it. Presently he stops. The singer rises to sing. He also uses an organ. His own throat is the organ he uses, and he can put into his music far more of the real spirit, because he is using himself, than he can who is using but the tubes of tin or wood." Christ is to Christian truth, not what the organist is to the music of the organ, but what the singer is to his song. And what Christ is to Christian truth that he must be to Christian theology.

Here we pause in the development of this theme. Most appropriate is the thought to which we have come to this occasion. We are here to dedicate a building to be devoted to theological education—to training in Lutheran theology. Without any degree of vanity we may glory in our Lutheranism. It is right that we should do so. There are many things in Lutheranism to inspire our reasonable pride. But most of all and mainly do we glory in it because of the central place which Christ has been given in our Confessions, in our Forms of Worship, in our methods of Church-work, in our polity, but especially in our theology. The essential distinctive feature of Lutheranism is to be found

in its theology. And the chief distinctive feature in its theology is, not some denominational dogma, but in the place which Christ has been given in that system. It is conservatively strict in its orthodoxy, stands for sound doctrine, gives the great events in the life of Christ their proper place in the work of Redemption, but its chief source of abiding strength consist in the fact that it recognizes the spirit of the divine living Christ in its formal statements. This is the vital test of sound Lutheranism. There are superficial tests and vital tests—tests that touch simply the outward forms and tests that touch the inner life. Correct forms of worship are important tests of external church life. Orthodoxy and sound doctrine is an important test of external and formal statements. Christ himself is the test of the inner life of these statements. This is the vital test of sound Lutheranism. Contemplate for a moment our prince of theologians, Dr. Martin Luther. Study carefully the processes of his mind and thought. He came not to Christ through doctrine, but he came to sound doctrine through Christ. Christ in him was the illumination which gave him that marvelous insight into doctrine which has been the wonder of generations since. Christ in him was the force which gave his utterances that mighty power which shook Europe and the world. And what the living Christ was in the theology of Luther that he has ever been in the pure theology of the Lutheran Church. Well does Dr. Schaff say: "The Lutheran piety has its peculiar charm,—the charm of Mary, who sat at Jesus' feet and heard his words * * The Lutheran Church meditated over the deepest mysteries of divine grace, and brought to light many treasures of knowledge from the mines of revelation. She can point to an unbroken succession of learned divines who devoted their whole lives to the investigation of saving truth. She numbers her mystics who bathed in the ocean of infinite love. She has sung the most fervent hymns to the Saviour, and holds sweet, child-like intercourse with the heavenly Father." The Lutheran Church is preëminently evangelical. Says Dr. Krauth, the younger: "No title could more strongly express her character, for preëminently is her system one which announces the glad tidings of

salvation, which excites joyous trust in Christ as a Saviour, which makes the sacraments bearers of saving grace. In no system is Christ so much as in the Lutheran; none exalt so much the glory of his person, of his office and of his work." The ringing keynote of its message to the world is the all-sufficiency of Christ's merits, the justifying power of faith in him. This is the great distinctive claim of its theology. And more and more as modern theology concentrates thought in Christ, is it tending to this essential feature of the Lutheran system, thus verifying the candid prediction of the elder Dr. Hodge made twenty years ago that the basis of the Lutheran theology was that to which all systems must finally conform.

And this, as I have studied it and conceived of it, is the theology of the institution in whose interest we are gathered here to-day. The statements which fix its basis, prepared by its first professor of theology, Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, are unequivocal. They cannot be misread or misunderstood. And upon this basis the theology of this institution rests to this day. That which we have pointed out as constituting preëminently the distinctive feature of the theology of Luther and of the Lutheran Church is just as preëminently the chief distinctive feature of the theology of this seminary.

This institution had its origin in the recognized necessity of careful theological training. A part of its design as stated was "to make the future ministers of the Church zealous and learned men; workmen that need not be ashamed, being qualified rightly to divide the word of truth, and to give unto each hearer his portion, both of instruction and edification, in due season." The importance of that statement needs to be emphasized anew. It is in strict accord with the high place which the Lutheran Church has always given to theological education.

And this institution stands unflinchingly for sound doctrine and scripture orthodoxy. It was designed "to provide our churches with pastors who sincerely believe and cordially approve of, the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures * * and who will therefore teach them in opposition to Deists, Unitarians, Arians, Antinomians, and all fundamental errorists."

And with equal clearness was the position of the institution fixed in its relation to the great Confession of the Church. The fathers declared "that in this seminary shall be taught, the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession." Upon the professors was imposed an obligation which now reads, "I believe the Augsburg Confession and the catechisms of Luther to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God." This constituted the first formal adoption of the Augsburg Confession in the printed constitution of any Lutheran synod or theological institution in this country. To the theologian who was mainly instrumental in giving this place to the confession in the Constitution of the General Synod and of its theological school should be given the credit of leading the way to place our Church and her institutions on the sound Lutheran basis. To the institution formed under his controlling hand and mind must be given the credit of being the first of the institutions of the Church in this country to place herself firmly on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. There she stands to-day, the mother in point of doctrine as well as in point of time of sound Lutheran theology in this land.

Recognizing the importance of thorough theological training, devoted to sound doctrine, standing for essential Lutheranism, there remains yet one other element to be noted in that basis. It is set forth in these words in its statement of design: "To make the future ministers of the church devoted and deeply pious men; by educating a number of them amid circumstances most favorable to the growth of genuine godliness, and affording the most powerful stimulus to its attainment." Very clearly and distinctly the end of this design as stated was that the theological training, the sound doctrine, the pure Lutheranism, here to be given should be animated by the inner experiences of personal piety,—Christ in the heart,—as the theological utterances of our own great Luther were made living things by the inner experiences of justifying faith through which he had passed. It provided for the perpetuity of the spirit and methods of genuine Pietism, which is but another name for evangelical Luther-

anism, in the constitution of the school of theological training. Lacking this, and the soundest Lutheranism, the purest orthodoxy, the most profound theological learning, is absolutely powerless against error.

On this day of dedication I would write upon the front of this building, in letters that glow and burn and shed their effulgent rays near and far, the name: "*Christ*." Around it I would draw a circle and upon it write: "*The truth as it is in Christ*;" for that can only be pure gospel truth which makes Christ the centre. Around this in wider circle I would write: "*Christian theology*;" for all Christian theology must be the formulated statement of the truth of which Christ is at once the centre and the life. And around this in yet wider circle I would write: "*The Augsburg Confession*;" for we firmly hold and believe that Confession to be a correct exhibition of the truth as it is in Christ. And not only as these encircling names concenter in the name of Christ, but as they reflect the light from the central name, would I make them legible to the human eye.

ARTICLE IV.

INDIVIDUALISM, OR TO EVERY ONE HIS WAY.*

BY HON. THOMAS HEDGE.

My thanks are due to that courtesy which permits me to forget the flight of more than a quarter of a century; to renew my youth, and once more as a college man to take part in the proceedings of commencement time.

It has concerned me much to determine in what way, or by what words I might come nearest to a contribution of usefulness here to-day, and risking my memory of what was *not* said to a certain ancient class at Yale, and following the notion that as it might have been helpful then it may be helpful now, I venture to offer a suggestion or two in consideration of your rights, responsibilities and duties as private and independent men and

*Address delivered at the Quarto-Centennial of Carthage College, May 29th, 1895.

women, as related to and compared with, but at the same time including and inseparably interwaved with, your duties as the citizens and sovereigns of the state.

It would seem a pleasant service to show the way; to relieve the anxiety of one entering a strange country, or standing doubtful, at the dividing of the ways,—but it is not always easy. The guide must have traveled it; with eyes open, and perceptions active. He must have intelligent appreciation and discriminating memory of all the obstructions, and misleading by-ways. He needs also a sympathetic insight into the character of him whom he would direct, of the kind and quantity of advice that will most efficiently serve him, and that he has capacity to receive. And the wisest of the older people who have trudged nearly to the end of the course of human life can do but little more for those who are to follow than to make their equipment for the journey a little more ample, to point out the particular blunders which delayed themselves, the mistakes which led them astray, the sources from which they reënforced their failing energy, the principle on which they worked out their course and the end which they sought to keep in sight and to obtain; to make fewer the offences which to human nature, and through human nature must come, to lessen the tribulation through which they may enter into the kingdom.

I have taken the title "*Individualism—or to Every One his Way;*" rather as a statement that there *is* a way intended for every one,—a way peculiar to himself—a way his own; and not as a call to a spirit of self assertion which, running counter to the accumulated wisdom of the ages, to settled and generally understood rules of right and wrong, to the ascertained laws of nature, to approved social institutions, or even to good manners, would set forth and enter a way merely because it is, or seems to be, strange, unique and original. No man liveth to himself. We are born in families, we fix our dwelling places in neighborhoods; we soon find that we, and those living near us are not only neighbors, but fellow citizens, and that in the latter sense

we are under the rule and protection of what is called municipal law. And here it is convenient that I should advert to the obligation of the citizen as subject to the law ; to the relation of the individual to human government, hoping to state nothing that is new or strange, or that has not been said many times, in many ways, to many people, but only to remind you of primary principles proclaimed as articles of political faith but too often, like other commonplace and fundamental truths, ignored or forgotten.

Human Government in its last estate is Force.
Physical Force—It is the last Resort.

In those matters and to that limit that the application of physical force may be right to enforce or to prevent human action, human government may have jurisdiction and authority—may compel the obedience of the citizen ; but it does not, and cannot define, prescribe and command the infinitely broader and higher duties of the man. There are moral obligations which have their source and their sphere in the soul, which are declared by the enlightened conscience and cannot be narrowed or strengthened by the sanctions of a code. What are public duties, and what are private is the most difficult task of statesmen to define. We can discern the blue of the zenith and the red of the morning horizon, but as they join and blend together in the ascending arches no human eye can mark the bounds of either. So to mark where the independence of the individual man begins to blend with his obligation as a citizen, to draw the line to which the authority of human law may reach, and within which it may compel obedience, and enforce service ; to set the limits of the divine right of government,—of no different quality or more divine or authentic in the majority, than in the anointed king—this is the constant and the highest problem of human wisdom and of human justice. All mathematical truths are self-evident ; but a degree of learning and of intelligence is needed that this self-evidence may be perceived, and so it is possible that some degree of intelligence and some careful attention may be necessary to the perception of self-evident political truths.

The American people prefer to accept the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, and therefore to understand them, although its truths declared to be self-evident were long denied and the rights it sets forth as unalienable have been withheld from millions of our race. We think, we believe that government, like the Sabbath, was made for man, and not man for government,—that man's essential rights were born with him, and were not created or conferred by human government, and that as human government does not create or confer rights, as it is but an institution for their security, so it cannot rightfully impair them or take them away.

We believe that all men are created equal—not in talents or graces or gifts, not in material fortune or earthly opportunity, but in political rights, and that they are alike entitled to the protection of the law; to that peaceful opportunity to develop and expand; not into equality or likeness of manhood; but each into the peculiar strength and fulness of character which his Creator purposed for him.

This human law is divinely authentic in public matters. It shall mark out and maintain the highway, shall set the landmark shall build the bridge, erect the light-house, certify the coin, enforce the contract, preserve the peace, prevent men from trespassing upon one another and secure to every man his own.

In its sphere it is supreme. In a world of sinners, and of fools and blind, an essential guard of our social order; the fence and bulwark of our human rights; and because and only because it is this guard, then for its necessity it may enforce the spending of our fortunes, and in its extremity the service of our labor and our lives.

I have dwelt thus upon these relations of the individual to the state, have repeated what I hope will be deemed common-places, because there seems to be a feeling prevalent among many well-meaning people who publish newspapers and print sermons that, in so far as one is aware of his own identity, he is less conscious of the presence and less thoughtful of the rights of his neighbors; that individualism as a rule of life tends to exclusion of regard for the good of the community, and to nar-

rowness of mind and meanness of purpose—apprehensions, it seems to me, founded in mistaken views of human duty and of human nature. The sum of duty is not limited by one's duty as a citizen; including this, but infinitely higher and broader, is his duty as a man. What this man is, what this entire man shall be; what his views of duty and of his moral obligation, depends upon and is measured by that proper personality which makes up his individuality. The character of the community is only the character of its individual people. Its institutions of commerce, of industry, of learning and of religion are founded, renewed, refined, sustained and overturned by them. Its theory of law, its conception of freedom, the extent and direction of its conquest, as well as its material strength and physical energy are derived only from the free spirit, the force of soul, the vigilant and jealous love of justice and of freedom of its individual people.

Through the foresight, the sense of duty, the importunate energy, the faith, the self-denial, the free sacrifice of individuals has the race thus far been led on to these large and wealthy places of peace and liberty. "These constitute the state who their duties know, who know their rights, and knowing dare maintain."

That rule of conduct and manner of life which centres in self and which ends in self, which seeks only its own; marked in its prosperity by self-righteousness, and in its adversity by misanthropic hate, is a partial and false, as well as unlovely individualism, concerning itself only with rights and not with their correlated duties and responsibilities. True individualism concerns itself with self-knowledge and self-development; *to the end that it may serve as well as enjoy*. It believes that the birth, the life and the destiny of the child this day born in this western paradise, are as fully within the notice and conscious purpose of the everlasting Father, as were the birth and destiny of him who beheld the beauty of Eden on the evening of the sixth day. That no man has been born whose life and service were not included and needed in the infinite plan. It therefore admits no inequality of rights, it forbids to call any man master. It holds that to each have been assigned his special duties and peculiar

way. It follows then, that there must be to each the largest degree of freedom, political, social and religious, that is consistent with the general security; that any abridgment of the right of the individual in act or speech or thought must prove its divine commission of authority. The historic experience of mankind would prove this, were it not already approved to our human reason.

The statutes do not mark the highest sense of right of the people. The things that are most honest and lovely and of best report cannot be enacted by the legislature; as easily might beauty be legislated upon the lilies of the field. Men are always better than their codes. These laws of personal conduct and criminal statutes, measures of that last resort we spoke of, only mark the limit of the general patience and prescribe that degree of decency in living only, which is indispensable and enforceable. Men are not scourged into manhood. Virtue, the name the Romans gave to manliness, is spontaneous, voluntary, an impulse from within. He never was a saint who was not free to be a sinner. It is freedom in conduct, it is self-respect. It is toiled after; in a degree helped or hindered by its environment, prosperity cannot long deceive or entice it and adversity best trains and strengthens it. It is upheld by the free spirit. It is the flower of true individuality.

But individualism also shows fairly as a practical principle of daily life, in our needful struggle for the things that perish!

It is only safe that each should learn himself and what things are his own and what another's. The Sermon on the Mount seems to enjoin the giving of that only which is one's own and by necessary inferences enforces the duty to acquire and the right to hold.

As neighbors we cannot assail or permit to be denied the right of another without weakening the defences of our own right and making less secure our enjoyment of our own. So intertwined are our interests and so interdependent are we on one another, so essentially and so constantly is each his brother's keeper, such unity is there in human right, so universal and far-reaching in application is the natural law of justice, like that

of gravitation, that one cannot be unjust to another without harm or hazard to himself; and the converse follows, that being just to himself he must *thereby* be just to his neighbors;—the maxim of Polonius is self-evident wisdom: "To thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

I have not intended to commend a cultivation of regard for one's own rights or interests or privileges, as an end or as a good in themselves, but only to suggest that it is useful and necessary to know what these are; that it is natural, proper and sometimes dutiful to assert, to insist upon, and to vindicate them, and while it may be decorous to hold them in abeyance it is rarely proper to permit them to be denied.

I have sought to show that the instinct of individualism is implanted for the purpose of exalting and enlarging the man; that it induces self-examination, self-knowledge, self-training, self-development. That it is indispensable to a just conception of one's relations and his obligations. That the danger of growth in selfishness lies only in the half knowledge which, perceiving and proclaiming the rights and talents, fails to discern their ends and purpose. A full understanding of one's rights involves the perception and acknowledgment of the reciprocal duties. An accurate knowledge of one's own powers, gifts and faculties is a pre-requisite to a just appreciation of what is expected of him and of what is due from him. The parable of the talents is given to all races and all generations of man. Its lesson is that to every one is entrusted certain peculiar means of *service*, and that each is answerable for his improvement of those means. It tolerates no negative or passive goodness. It demands of every man active energy in the improvement of what we call his advantages on the line marked out and to the end appointed for him.

We believe that every man was sent hither by his Creator to serve his Creator and his fellowmen in a separate, distinct and peculiar way; that there are no copies or substitutes or supernumeraries on this stage of life; that each should act his part, and that the problem of life consists first in learning what that

part is. The community with its multifarious industries, its out-reaching enterprise and extended commerce, the school, the church, the college, the neighborhood, the family, are all helps and agencies to discover the proper service and to equip and train for its true performance.

And freedom stumbles and civilization advances with halting step, and statecraft blunders, and men are weary and sour-minded, and creation groaneth and travaileth because in spite of their means of learning, men fail to learn and to measure themselves; to find what they are fit for, and to fit themselves for their appointed work and destiny.

Misleading ourselves with the maxim, "What man has done man can do," square men scramble into round places, little men lose themselves in large places and weak men dizzy themselves in high places.

We protest continually our respect for labor, but attach its dignity to the place where it is done rather than to its quality and its use. There is no dignity on the face of the earth except in labor, but its dignity is properly measured only by its degree of needfulness, of usefulness; its thoroughness, its honesty and the wideness of its beneficence in help and influence.

There is dignity in doing the useful thing that one is skilled to do, and only in that; one man's usefulness and dignity (that is worthiness) lies in his hands, another's in his head, and the degree of worthiness is found in the quality of the work of hands or head. It is more worthy a man to make a true shoe than a false sermon, or an unrighteous law.

Ralph Waldo Emerson splitting a shingle four ways with one nail made a sincere effort; in which sincerity of effort there was a strain of dignity, but in the labor itself persisted in there would have been none. It would have been a waste of shingles and of Emerson, and he never did split another shingle, but learned to hit and drive other nails, philosophical and poetical, to the comfort of us all, and therein was and is his dignity. The carpenter whose hammer he borrowed for his mechanical essay would have split the Art of Poetry with a single verse; and he had sense to know it and to know that he would better build a

house and he laid an honest roof for Emerson and there found and proved his dignity.

Do we not err in measuring success in life by its conspicuousness? If we have thought rightly so far, that each is sent here on his own errand, intrusted with his own peculiar task, is not the fidelity which measures his course and his labor the true measure and standard of success? Taught as we are by the science of nature that every atom of this dusty earth has its place and office to keep the swing and balance of the universe, do we dare to measure and assign success by any rule than that the servant accepted and did well the work that he was sent to do?

Is there not a lesson in the old lines that is worth a new consideration?

"We need not bid for cloistered cell
Our neighbor and our work farewell,
Nor strive to wind ourselves too high
For sinful man beneath the sky;
The daily round, the common task,
Would furnish all we ought to ask;
Room to deny ourselves; a road
To bring us daily nearer God."

On the morrow the American people will manifest their love for those who served them thirty years ago. They will gather in those places where repose the mortal part of the first American, and of him who was the greatest peacemaker of mankind, reverently as if in the temples of religion, and rightly so; but equally and as surely, at the grave of the boy, whose name is now kept only in some family Bible; of whom we only know that he was dutiful, that death found him keeping his faith on lonely picket or in "the fiery edge of battle." If the ears of our understanding are opened, shall we hear the old word and divine: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

To those whose lines have fallen in these pleasant places, who have been growing into fitness for the struggle and conquest of life under the serene light of this school of learning, to whom are soon to be entrusted the work and management and advancement of this world, whatever I have said means simply that you

were sent by that infinite power which created this world to fulfil a part of the infinite purpose for which it was first set in its orbit.

That to you have been entrusted (to each his own) certain rights and powers and gifts; that upon you are imposed corresponding and inseparable obligations, and before you lies a boundless field and infinite variety of opportunity.

The first command "Let there be light" was not fully or finally fulfilled when the sun and moon and stars rolled out from chaos into the glory of the firmament. It is a continuing command, renewed with every rising sun, repeated to every rising generation. And there are stars like that of the evening for splendor, or like that of the north for guidance, but all for light and help to humanity. You are to be the light of the world, it is yours to answer what that light shall be. In your hands are to be its laws, its learning, its work, its speech, its music, its good or its evil.

We older folk who have had more than half our day cannot promise you unmixed happiness even in the line of duty. We cannot foretell in what joy or sorrow you shall be schooled, and perfected. We can have no higher wish for you than that you shall earn and not gain, shall be and not seem; that prosperity shall not deceive or entice you, that adversity shall not harden or embitter you, that you shall find all sweetness in its uses. That, each for himself, discerning and developing the powers entrusted to you, using the strength and grace which are your birthright, you shall serve your generation according to the will of God.

ARTICLE V.

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM AND THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

BY JOHN J. YOUNG, D. D.

The term "religious fanaticism" is with some writers and lecturers a very familiar and favorite one. For the sake of variety it appears that the phrase "blind orthodoxy" is occasionally used in its stead. From the way the expression is frequently used it looks as though there were but one form of fanaticism. The term, however, shows that there must be various forms, and that the fanaticism spoken of here is limited altogether to the sphere of religion. Since, according to the familiar and favorite expression used by some writers and lecturers, men are liable to become fanatics upon other subjects besides religion, it is not only unbecoming but also unjust to ascribe almost every act performed by a fanatic to religion. In fact the person who persistently, impatiently and fiercely ascribes every act, that may be denominated as fanatical, to religion, may be unconsciously a fiercer fanatic than the persons whom he so bitterly denounces as religious fanatics. If all the acts, often indiscriminately and gratuitously ascribed to religious fanaticism,—even the crucifixion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—were carefully examined, some of them would, beyond all doubt, fall under philosophical, and many under political fanaticism; and I firmly believe that a large percentage would fall under covetousness; which, according to South, is the first vice in corrupt nature that moves, and the last to die. A still closer examination might reveal, in some instances, the religious fanaticism so loudly spoken of to exist only in the mind of the virulent calumniator of God's holy word, and the Church of our ever blessed Redeemer.

Whilst it is not the object of this paper to apologize for religious fanaticism, nor justify its hatred and fanatical actions toward those who may think otherwise on the subject of religion, but calmly, candidly and impartially find out what religious fa-

naticism had to do with the death of Christ, the investigation will, nevertheless, show that much now labeled as religious fanaticism does not contain a particle of the genuine article.

1. Let us look, in the first place, at some of the *definitions* given of the word fanaticism in order to get a clearer view of the term. The Standard Dictionary—which now stands at the head of all English dictionaries—defines the word as follows: "The spirit or conduct characteristic of a fanatic; extravagant or frenzied zeal; as, the *fanaticism* of the Mahdists." A fanatic is defined as, "One who is actuated by extravagant or intemperate zeal; one who is moved by a frenzy of enthusiasm; especially, a religious zealot; a ferocious bigot." Webster defines a fanatici as, "A person affected by excessive enthusiasm, particularly on religious subjects." Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, Vol. I., p. 798, gives the following under fanaticism: "The term 'fanatic' was originally applied to all priests who pretended to receive divine revelations, and announced oracles, but more especially to the priests of Cybele and Bellana, who were noted for their wild enthusiasm. In the writings of the satirists, Horace, Juvenal, etc., the word gradually changed its sense, and came to imply something of fraudulent inspiration, consisting of hollow excitement and empty visions. In this sense it was still used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when applied, for instance, to Cromwell, Mohammed, the prophets of the Church of the Desert, etc. At present the term 'fanaticism' denotes a state of the mind in which enthusiasm for an idea has been transformed into mere hatred of the opposite." In McClintock and Strong Cyclopædia, Vol. III., p. 481, we find about the same definition. After giving the views of the ancients on the subject, we read: "The word is sometimes improperly used to stigmatize such Christians as are 'zealously affected in a good thing,' (Gal. 4 : 18). Its only legitimate application is to such as add to enthusiasm and zeal for the cause which they believe to be the cause of truth a hatred of those who are opposed to them, whether in politics, philosophy, or religion." Isaac Taylor is then quoted as saying: "After rejecting from account that opprobrious sense of the word fanaticism which the virulent ca-

luminator of religion and of the religious assigns to it, it will be found, as we believe, that the elementary idea attaching to the term in its manifold application is that of *fictitious fervor* in religion, rendered turbulent, morose, or rancorous by junction with some one or more of the unsocial emotions. Or, if a definition as brief as possible were demanded, we should say that fanaticism is enthusiasm inflamed by hatred." This is undoubtedly as brief a definition as can be given.

2. Having now become somewhat acquainted with the term, our next inquiry must be: *Was the religious sentiment of those Jews, who had Christ put to death, so perverted that their enthusiasm for their religion was inflamed by and transformed into hatred of every other religious sentiment?* This will necessarily require a brief review of the religious sentiment and condition of the Jews during that period. From the Bible and the writings of Josephus, the Jewish historian, we learn that the Jews were, at that time, somewhat divided. This division was partly political and partly religious. Two divisions, or parties, are referred to in the sacred Scriptures. The one most frequently mentioned is the Pharisaic party.

The Pharisees were "separatists," separating themselves from the people on account of their superior piety. There seems to have been four tendencies in this party: a philosophical, political, ascetic and literal-interpretation tendency. Some believe to have discovered no less than seven different tendencies. These Pharisees, composed of various tendencies, were the champions of national independence. Quietly did they stir up a national hatred toward Rome; and in doing this they were not particular in the selection of means. They were known as the orthodox party. The written law was, according to their view, to be supplemented by tradition. They believed in the existence of angels and spirits; the resurrection of the body; the final judgment and future life. Great stress was laid upon the Messianic promises contained in the Scriptures; they were strict predestinarians; great proselytists, and some of them were zealots.

The other party mentioned in the Holy Scriptures was known

as *Sadducees*. The Richtung of this party was almost the opposite to that of the Pharisees. Instead of carrying on a continual warfare with their surroundings, they tried to accommodate themselves to circumstances and make the best of their political connection with Rome. Seeing that they could neither conquer nor assimilate themselves with the world, they tried to live in peace with it. Hence they were friendly to the foreigners and in return received many favors from them. Being nearly all aristocrats they occupied an influential position in the political as well as the social life of their nation. As far as religious enthusiasm is concerned little was found among the Sadducees. They were not very religious; notwithstanding the fact that they occupied the chief religious offices at the time. In opposition to the Pharisees they rejected all tradition; denied the existence of angels and spirits; opposed the doctrines of immortality, resurrection, final judgment and future life. They did not cherish the Messianic hope of the nation, made no proselytes and were no zealots. And whilst the Pharisees made everything depend upon a divine predestination, the Sadducees made everything depend upon man's free will. They believed in the present life only, and made the nation's civil and religious interests subservient to their own. Wealth, nobility and power were of greater importance to them than the social, civil and religious interests of their people; and to maintain these they were ready to sacrifice everything in their way. Their policy was more stern and severe than that of the Pharisees. It did not take Caiaphas, the high priest and official head of the Sadducees, long to decide how to prevent the people from following Christ. Quickly he came to the short, stern and decisive conclusion, that "it is expedient that one die." In the eyes of the Sadducees political expediency demanded the death of this man, be he innocent or not. Rather than sacrifice wealth, nobility and power, the Sadducee would even put the Son of Man to death.

Besides these two parties there was, at this time, a third party among the Jews known as the *Essenes*. This party is not mentioned in the Bible. The historian Josephus gives us an ac-

count of the same. Both their origin and precise views are involved in considerable obscurity. From what can be gathered the members of this party lived a retired and peaceable life; providing the supplies of all their wants with their own hands. Celibacy was the rule of this party. They reprobated slavery and war, took no oath, and were strict observers of the Sabbath. There appears also to have been a tendency to sun-worship among them. Whilst they believed with the Pharisees in angels and the immortality of the soul, they denied the resurrection of the body.

The name "Scribes" frequently appears in the holy Scriptures also, hence one might conclude that the Scribes were a separate party, like those referred to above. Such, however, is not the case. The word refers rather to an occupation or order, than a party. Whilst they were not a separate party they were, nevertheless, divided into two distinct schools. These were named after the great teachers, Shammai and Hillel. The disciples of the former were vehemently and rigidly orthodox; the latter were orthodox in a more liberal sense; whatever Shammai bound Hillel loosed.

3. Having thus briefly reviewed the religious condition of the Jews at the time of Christ's death, the question arises now: *Which of these parties caused Pontius Pilate to crucify Christ; and, was it their religious fanaticism that led them to do so?* As far as the Essenes are concerned it is evident that they had nothing to do with the death of Christ. In fact, it is doubtful whether they ever came in contact with him. And as far as the Roman Governor, Pontius Pilate, is concerned, we have abundant evidence that it was not religious fanaticism, but fear of losing his governorship that caused him to have Christ crucified. We must therefore turn to the Pharisees and Sadducees in order to find out what religious fanaticism had to do with the death of Christ.

It appears that after the raising of Lazarus official steps were taken to remove Christ. At the first recorded meeting to consider said removal, recorded Jno. 11 : 47-53, there were present the chief priests—at whose head stood Caiaphas, the civil or official high priest—and the Pharisees. Since the high priestly

office was at that time in the hands of the Sadducees, the chief priest, spoken of here as present at this council, must have belonged to that party also. It should be remembered that the office of the high priest was, at this time, no longer a permanent religious office, as it had been originally, but had been degraded into a temporary political office; and was at this time entirely in the hands of the Sadducees. Annas, the man before whom our Saviour was first examined, according to Jno. 18 : 13, was from all accounts, the leader of the Sadducee party, and controlled said party and the high-priestly office for about fifty-five years—from 8-63 A. D.—notwithstanding the fact that he filled the office of the high-priest only seven years, having been deposed by Valerius Gratus in the year 15 A. D. He exercised this controlling power through his son-in-law Caiaphas and his five sons, whom he, according to Josephus, B. XX. chapt. IX. sect. 1, managed to keep in office till 63 A. D. Annas was, from all accounts, a shrewed political manipulator—a veritable political boss—the very life and soul of the Sadducee party; one of the prime movers, if not the prime mover, of Christ's death. Hence the council referred to in John 11 : 47 was composed of Sadducees and Pharisees. At this council Caiaphas, the official high-priest, who was a Sadducee, declared that it were better that Christ were put to death than that the present movement should end in Roman intervention and the destruction of their present power. That the loss of the power intrusted into their hands by the Romans was the principal thing they were concerned about, and must have been uppermost in their minds when they said: "And the Romans shall come, and take away both our place and nation," is evident from the fact that the Jews were already under Roman dominion. According to the deliberations of this council our Saviour was to be put to death for political expediency; and not because his teachings were at variance with the recognized standards of the Jewish religion. If there was any fanaticism in the conclusion of this council surely it cannot be called religious fanaticism, for the whole affair seems to have been a political transaction. It may be that there were some religious fanatics among the Phar-

isees present at this meeting, and had our Saviour's death been suggested by one of the Pharisees, religious fanaticism might have prompted said suggestion. But since it was Caiaphas, the high-priest, a Sadducee, son-in-law and tool of the unscrupulous political boss, Annas, it is very questionable whether religious fanaticism suggested the idea that Christ should be put to death for political expediency. For all we know religious fanaticism may have had as little to do with the expediency suggested by Caiaphas, as it had to do with the "friendly council" suggested by Russia,—backed up by France and Germany—to Japan concerning the Liao-Tung peninsula; or, as it had to do with the eating of the forbidden fruit in Paradise.

According to Matt. 26 : 3, two days before the Passover, another meeting took place in the palace of the high-priest. Since this meeting took place "when Jesus had finished all these sayings" and two days before the feast of the Passover, it is very likely that it took place on Tuesday evening after our Saviour had closed his labors as a public teacher. At this council it was determined to "take Jesus by subtilty and kill him." But "not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people;" who were then gathered in and about Jerusalem. This assembly was composed, according to Matthew, of "the chief-priests, and the Scribes, and the elders of the people." Being held in the high-priest's palace, we have reason to believe that it was largely composed of Sadducees and their sympathizers, since the name of the Pharisees is not mentioned. In fact, from the session of this council till Pilate is called upon to secure the tomb, where the remains of the crucified Redeemer lay buried, the Pharisees disappear, as such. John 18 : 3, where he describes the men who went out with Judas to capture Christ, mentions the name; and that seems to be the only time it is referred to during that entire transaction. Judas deals with the chief-priests. The chief-priests and the council sought false witnesses against Jesus to put him to death. The same party condemned him; brought him before Pontius Pilate; accused him vehemently; besought the people to choose Barabbas; cried, "crucify him, crucify him;" and said to Pilate: "If thou let this man go, thou

art not Cæsar's friend." From the accounts handed down to us by the Evangelists it appears that the entire proceedings against our Saviour, beginning with the council held on Tuesday evening in the high-priest's palace till he was dead and buried, were carried on by the priestly families and their sympathizers. The question confronts us now: Why do the priestly Sadducees and their aristocratic friends, who formerly never troubled themselves about Christ, act thus? Was it their religious zeal inflamed into hatred against him? This might be said of the Pharisees, who for some reason are at present not coöperating with the Sadducees, but it can never be said of the aristocratic and religiously indifferent Sadducees. Something else besides religious fanaticism must be the real cause of their present procedure; something that has taken place lately must have aroused the ire of the priestly families; something that is nearer and dearer to them than their religion must have been interfered with by Jesus of Nazareth.

A careful examination of the accounts given in the Gospels will show, beyond doubt, that it was *envy*, and not religious fanaticism, that moved the chief-priest to condemn Christ, and deliver him to Pilate to be crucified. Matthew, 27 : 18, says: "For he," that is Pilate, "knew that for envy they had delivered him." Mark's testimony, 15 : 10, is even still plainer in that it describes the persons who delivered Jesus. He says: "For he knew that the chief-priests had delivered him for envy." This is reliable testimony and not mere assertion without any proof. According to this evidence religious fanaticism no more moved the chief-priests to deliver Christ to Pontius Pilate, than it moved the patriarchs to sell their brother Joseph to the Midianites. Nebe, in his *Leidensgeschichte*, gives some reasons for this envy. In vol. II., p. 89 he says: "There were many things for which the high-priests could envy Jesus. He surpassed them in wisdom and understanding, also in the ability to teach and in the power of speech. Miracles were his works and righteousness his course of life. But for all these advantages they would not have envied him, if he had not made such a deep impression

upon the people, so that they came by hundreds and thousands to see and hear him. Through this their respect among the people was greatly injured, and their influence diminished. They, the chief-priests, would be and remain the leaders of the people. Their dominion they would divide with no one." According to Nebe's view, and he is not alone, it was a question of leadership and dominion with the chief-priests, and not a question of religion. Loss of respect and power over the people caused them to envy Jesus—not religion, nor religious fanaticism.

May there, however, not be still some other reason besides leadership and dominion over the people? A careful investigation of these Sadducean chief-priests will show that they were not only lovers of political power, but that they also had a hankering after money. We are told that they loved money so much that instead of taking the expenses connected with the public morning and evening sacrifices out of the public temple treasury, they demanded that said expenses should be met by private contributions; claiming that the entire temple treasury was their own. This claim of the Sadducean chief-priests was bitterly contested by the Pharisees, and was one of the many points on which these two parties disagreed. See McClintock & Strong, *Cycl.* vol. ix., p. 238. Avarice, "the besetting sin of the Jewish race," seems to have been "the besetting sin" of the Sadducean chief-priests. In fact it looks as though the word "Avarice" were not strong enough for we ever find the word "rapacious" used to express their greedy desire for the precious metal. Their love of money was so great that it caused them, according to Christ's own words, to make a "house of merchandise," and a "den of thieves" out of the temple of the living God. See John 2 : 16 and Matt. 21 : 13. May it not be that his action and words, at the second cleansing of the temple, toward those who were carrying on the unholy traffic within the sacred courts, aroused the envy of the chief-priests even more than their loss of esteem and power over the people? It should be remembered that the second cleansing of the temple took place on Monday of the same week in which he was condemned, and delivered to Pilate to be crucified. That that traffic was carried on

under the sanction, and for the profit of the chief-priests, is self-evident. Hence, the manner in which Christ proceeded against the same would not only make them contemptible in the eyes of the people, but would also greatly reduce their unholy revenue. This, undoubtedly, led the chief-priests to the hasty, harsh and relentless proceedings against Christ. Farrar, in his *life of Christ*, p. 405, throws a great deal of light on this subject in the following words: "To interfere with these [the shops in the temple] was to rob them of one important source of that wealth and worldly comfort to which they attached such extravagant importance. There was good reason why Hanan, the head representative of 'the viper brood,' as a Talmudic writer calls them, should strain to the utmost his cruel prerogative of power to crush a prophet whose actions tended to make him and his powerful family at once wholly contemptible and comparatively poor." This love of money had perhaps more to do with the envy spoken of in the Gospels than anything else. Is not covetousness described, in Col. 3 : 5, as idolatry; and the love of money, in 1 Tim. 6 : 10, as the root of all evil? Yes, and it is this greedy desire to have more that has not only led man to rob God of the fear, love and trust due him; but it has also led him to inflict untold extortions, oppressions, persecutions and sufferings upon himself. It has led him to turn beautiful cities into heaps of ruins, and rich fields into a barren wilderness. It has caused man to slay his fellow man; and human blood to flow like water. It has induced Judas Iscariot to sell his Lord and Master for thirty pieces of silver; and led the chief-priests to condemn the promised Messiah and deliver him to Pontius Pilate to be crucified. And what this greedy desire to have more, this intense selfishness, has done, it is doing to-day, and will continue to do until through faith in him, whom the chief-priests, urged on by this greedy desire to have more, this intense selfishness, condemned and delivered to Pontius Pilate to be crucified. The only remedy for it is found in the Victim of it. Only he, who was made a curse for us, can deliver us from this curse.

Thus we see, that if religious fanaticism played any part, at

all, in the condemnation and delivery of Christ to be crucified, it must have been an exceedingly insignificant part, indeed; so insignificant that it is difficult to trace; whilst envy, covetousness and intense selfishness stand forth as the sun at high noon. The question arises now, Why is it that with certain persons the term "religious fanaticism," and kindred phrases, is such a familiar and favorite expression—ascribing even the death of Christ to the same?

Is it because these persons have never examined this subject and have thus far been entirely guided by hearsay? If so, we would kindly advise them to inform themselves on a subject so important before they use the term in that relation again.

Or, is it because they wish to stigmatize religion—especially the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—and brand it as making men worse, more cruel, easier and more powerful tools of Satan than they would be otherwise? If so, they ought to come forth from their hiding place and prove it.

Or, is it because the term "religious fanaticism," and kindred phrases, excludes those who make God and his holy word objects of contemptuous mirth, do all in their power to undermine the faith of Christians and the influence of the Christian Church and speak in a most unbecoming manner of the Christian ministry, whilst the terms envy, covetousness and intense selfishness would not exclude them? If so, the question arises, What difference is there between these persons and the envious, covetous and intensely selfish chief-priests, who condemned our Saviour and delivered him for envy to Pontius Pilate to be crucified? I fear that these persons are in very bad company, without even being aware of the fact. May God have mercy upon them!

ARTICLE VI.

THE CENTRALITY OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.

BY REV. EDWIN HEVL DELK.

Our century has witnessed the rise and fall of three promised saviors of society. Democracy, Science and Socialism have each, in turn, been declared the sure roads to civic order and social satisfaction. The attainment of our American autonomy, and the French Revolution of 1789, made possible the experiment in democracy. The Declaration of Independence, and The Rights of Man, framed by the brilliant Frenchman Dumont, came to down trodden peoples like a new gospel of emancipation. In France, feudalism was overthrown and the dogma of the equality of man proclaimed from the house tops. No student of history can regret or ignore the exhilaration and hope created by this bold democratic manifesto. The promises made by the French National Assembly and the glittering watchword of the Revolution, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," came like the evangel of an opulent peace to the liberated Parisians. The ideal presented was entrancing. The promise of political equality and social satisfaction filled the imagination with visions of national glory and economic abundance. How did the promises of democracy fulfill themselves? Let us give speedy honor to all the benefits that have come to us through the democratic principle. Absolutism and class privilege have been broken. The sovereignty of the nation has been accepted. Every worthy citizen enjoys the privilege and duty of political self-expression. The people as a whole, and not a titled aristocracy, is the first class considered by modern legislation. Yes, democracy has accomplished many reforms and secured for us invaluable liberties for press and pulpit, school and forum. But the conviction deepens that, beyond the form of government, the real question is the question of individual character. Dumont himself asked: "Are all men equal? Where is the equality? Is

it in virtue, talents, fortunes, industry, situation? Are they free by nature? So far from it, they are born in a state of complete dependence on others, from which they are long of being emancipated." The value of Burke's attack on the exaggerations of revolutionary democracy is receiving new evidence as we begin to realize that no one form of government assures social peace and perfection. You can't build a cathedral out of chunks of mud. However wise and just may be the plan of a government, the mere *form* will not save the individual, or the citizenship as a whole. Democracy, as a social savior, has failed us. The corruption and poverty of New York is as pitiable and great as in Berlin or St. Petersburg. The very champions of democracy cry out for a fresh ally in the work of civic and social betterment.

The next aspirant for social regeneration was science. Disgusted with the scholastic restrictions and methods of mediævalism, the seekers after nature's origins and actions discarded the formulas and speculative methods of the cloister and bookmen and, by the path of immediate contact with rock and human organism, determined to ferret out the secret of the universe. "Give us time, and we will tell you the ultimate truths of all life—organic, inorganic, and spiritual." Science promised us the final revelation of truth and goodness. In the middle decades of our century she was boisterous, if not positively arrogant, in her claim to dominate all other teachers and leaders in thought. Who will deny that Bacon, Farrady and Huxley, with their inductive method of approach to nature, have given us the true principle of discovery. Science has made splendid conquests in the realm of lower nature and given us sure rules and sane ideals in the realm of hygiene and civic comfort. The reign of law is no small lesson to have taught the world. Her lesser gifts of electrical apparatus, chemical products, studies in primitive life forms and her impressive tracings of the evolutionary advance towards man, are joy and crown enough for any body of human investigators. But as a guide and motive power in individual and social life, science has failed us in our greatest hours of need. Geology, biology, sanitation and vaccination do

not touch the vitals of life. Proven science has no final word to offer on all the deepest and ultimate problems of life. Whence come all things, what is man—his conscience, his prayer, and whither is he going? Towards these ultimates, science is agnostic or impatient. The first cause as well as the final cause of the universe is beyond her ken. In the presence of poverty, social injustice, moral depravity, and the spiritual outcries of the soul, she sits like the impassive Sphinx amid the hot, throbbing desert of life. Her votaries, who once shouted themselves hoarse in the so-called "warfare of science and religion," have finally discovered that, on the proper field of science, there is no battle with real religion at all, that science cannot even advance into the territory of true religion without acknowledging a superior power to mere intellect. Pure science, as a social leader, has suffered defeat and passes the ultimate problems of life over to the moralist and theologian. Man's social and spiritual questionings demand a more competent and effective leader.

Midway in the century, socialism arose to declare that the government ownership and direction of all the productive and distributive forces of the nation would usher in the reign of international peace and plenty. Poverty was declared the root of all evil. Labor was proclaimed the source of all values. Mark's book, "*Capital*," became the bible of the discontented workmen of Germany, France and England. "Once reorganize the industrial life of the nation," he advised, "on the basis of socialism and then shall be ushered in the reign of social peace and plenty." How eagerly the cry was taken up. How true was much of the picture he presented. Poverty, hatred, a brutal fight for employment, disease, disgust, hopeless submergence of the lowest stratum, overcrowded poorhouses, useless charities and aristocratic contempt for democratic aspirations—all this was the groundwork and reason for industrial reformation. To transform the social order then seemed simple enough. His shallow philosophy and economic fallacy was hid in a mist of statistics and prejudice. Democracy, we were told, had brought political equality, socialism would insure equal industrial opportunity. In time this would lead to every social satisfaction. Industrial

organization was declared the pivotal point in social well being. Socialism had not yet accepted Hegel's word—"The social order, however omnipotent it may seem, is limited and finite, and that man has in him a kindred with the eternal." In a word, man has other and higher needs than the merely economic and civil satisfactions. "Man cannot live by bread alone." No! nor by education, yachts and brown-stone fronts. The range of man's needs encompass all loves, charities and purities both human and divine. Slowly, but surely, even the leaders of socialism are beginning to realize the impotency of merely industrial and educational reforms for the uplifting and completion of life.

One of the most notable books of the year was written by a brilliant and well-to-do Oxonian. The book is entitled, "The Melancholy of Stephen Allard." This modern Burton, after trying to satisfy his life first by scientific research, then in philosophic examinations, by poetic form and insight, through artistic color and story, then by the moralities of Aurelius and Comte, later by the mysticism of modern religionists, afterward by the invigorations of travel and action, subsequently by the delights of love, came, at last, to realize the futility which follows every attempt by purely secular interests to attain social and personal satisfaction. *The Journal of Amiel*, and the pessimistic philosophy of Schopenhauer are not exceptional aspects of modern thought and literature. The "Decadents" are a respectable minority. Permit me to use the better words of "Jan Maclaren:" "We are living at the close of the century, and the last years of the century are suffering from the decrepitude and from the failings of old age. The blood of the century is running thin and cold, and the hopes of the century are few and dark. There is no great poet left us; there is no great novelist left us; there is no man now for the coming of whose new book we hunger and thirst, or which would cause us to make preparations that we might sit up all night to read it to the breaking of the day. These men are gone, and smaller men are in their places. Science herself, which had a career of such singular success and glory, is not making great advances now, but is rather gathering up the fruit of earlier discoveries. No wonder there are men

who are cynical; no wonder literature is pessimistic; no wonder an able writer, who published his book and died, declared that there are no more conquests for science and literature, no more achievements for the human race. There is only one institution on the face of the earth to-day that carries the dew of her youth, and that is Christianity. I do not mean the Christianity which is engaged simply in criticism, however useful these exercises may be; there is no heart for a man there. I do not mean either the Christianity which is peddling away with questions as to how long a man is to work and how much he is to get, for men with spirit want to work every moment, and ask only the reward of having done their duty; there is no inspiration there. I mean the old Christianity and the first Christianity, the Christianity that centers around the person of the Son of God; the Christianity with the lifted head and the eternal sunshine upon her face."

What, then, are the factors in Christianity which give it the effective and central position among all the forces which go to the conserving and regeneration of society? In a sentence I reply. The Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the regeneration of the individual life. These three factors find their expression and fulfillment in a person—Jesus Christ and his continuous life throughout the centuries.

In these last days, we have heard a great deal about brotherhood and fellowship. We have much so-called brotherhood which is only class organization for material benefit. Engineers, plasterers, Irish clans, privy orders, German turnvereins, internationalists and trades-unionism are but class or party clubs, not pretending to include employer, or women, or men of alien race, the poor, the rich, the strong, the weak, the saint and sinner, but their basis and circle of brotherhood stop with a restricted membership and a section of society. Defiance of the public will and weal has characterized some of their actions.

At best, they are mutual benefit societies not much higher in their spirit and operation than the insurance company and social club. A brotherhood with such an insecure and limited ba-

sis will not reach far or mount high. Humanitarianism, in all its phases, without religious reinforcement, has proven a pathetic failure.

Christian brotherhood has a far richer origin, sweep of interest, and power of reconstruction. Christian fellowship has its birth in the belief in God—in God the Father who art in heaven, who has made of one blood all men who dwell beneath the skies. The one father makes possible the many brothers. Eliminate his creatorship and will from the brotherhood and it goes to pieces upon the rocks of self-interest, upon class and racial antagonisms. God is the first cause, the author of the moral law and the source of love's fellowship. He is the creative centre of all sympathies and all holy ideals of the state. His kingdom is the goal of history. He is the answer to humanity's perplexities and sufferings and aspirations. Society without God could be paralleled only by the chaos of hurtling planets without a central sun. Christian fellowship is unique because it has enthroned above it a creative power and intelligence guiding all cosmic and social law. Given this incentive and goal of God the Father, and the whole of life is swept within the sphere of assured faith and abiding love.

Christian fellowship is no less unique in its conception of the solidarity of Society. Long before the economic dogma of social solidarity became an accepted fact in practical statesmanship St. Paul had declared, "Ye are all members one of another." If one member suffers all the members suffer with it, or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it." It would be wrong to quote these words as his belief in the modern theory of mutual social dependence. He believes that and something more. His social solidarity was a spiritual oneness in Christ. It was an organism of dependence, but dependence upon a central spiritual master. It was a brotherhood not for individual advantage through an organization but an association of individuals for the uplift of the whole of society. The incarnate Son of God was to be its supreme head. His life and will were to be both law and light. As the Father had sent him into the world to be the friend of pauper and sinner, so Christ sent his

work-fellows into the world to encompass with the gospel of peace all classes, all conditions, all nationalities. There is a brotherhood larger than trade, than church, than black, than white, than country—that brotherhood is the kingdom of God. I call this brotherhood Christian because Jesus Christ is the only sufficient propulsive force for the realization of such a supernal ideal. No man cometh unto the Father but by him and no man cometh unto his fellow man truly, until he comes in the Spirit of Jesus Christ. That modern Christian Knight, the Earl of Shaftesbury, pushing a coster-monger's cart along a London street in order to express his sympathy and gain the experience of their hard life, the modern university settlements amid the squalor and emptiness of the average day laborer's section of the city, the self-consecration of many a city missionary to the rescue of criminal and outcast, the tender consideration of many a high bred woman for the woes of orphaned childhood and more helpless old age, the resolute faith of the plain deaconess confronted by the hot passion and grief of a dissolute woman, the daring attack on slavery and intemperance and corporate greed by a disinterested ministry, the outpoured wealth for pagan souls beyond the seas, all declare the supremacy and graciousness of that brotherhood which has Calvary for its controlling centre.

This recalls the third element in Christian fellowship—the regeneration of the individual. The elemental defect in our social life is not organization but character. The discord which breeds the bulk of our intemperance, crime and pauperism has its source in a distorted moral nature. The root of all crime, greed, pride, hate, lust and murder is selfishness. Great as is the light and power given through education and legislation, not until these two splendid arms of the social body are directed in their work by a purified heart, can they accomplish the highest civilization. Every member of an educational board, or labor union, knows that the most beneficent program of social improvement is a mere paper constitution until invigorated and executed by strong moral impulse. It is because men are shiftless, arrogant, suspicious, and piggish that all our fine schemes of

coöperation and universal culture go to pieces. At Exeter Hall, in London, at the close of a great labor demonstration, an old mechanic was called upon to make the closing speech. It was short but it hit the nail on the head. He said, "The speakers who have preceded me have spoken of the urgent need of legislation to redress our wrongs and of education for the working-men's children. This is all right. Legislate, legislate, legislate, educate, educate, educate, but let no man forget our greatest and most important work is to, regenerate, regenerate, regenerate."

The great needs of humanity are faith in God and man. Without the purity born of God and self-sacrifice like unto the Son of Man, the social ideals painted by socialist and poet, however worthy, are but tantalizing and impossible fantasies. We want a religion which can wash the blood-stains from our hands and rout the devil from our hearts. This we find in our faith. Remember the words of Lecky, the historian of European Rationalism and morals,—“It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love, and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the highest incentive to its practice and has exerted so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of those short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and than all the exhortations of moralists.”

To be more specific, permit me to indicate several spheres where this Christian fellowship should be made the central and controlling principle.

First, in the industrial life of society. The labor question is not a question of mere justice. Whatever may be the form of industrial organization, whether it be the wages system, coöperation, or state socialism, the ultimate question is the question of a complete and satisfied manhood. Though the employer may pay every cent of a rightful wage, even if he is willing to share his profits with his employees, if in the coöperative establish-

ment all the shareholders get their promised part of interest and benefit on the invested capital, granted, if you will, the establishment of nationalism, or socialism, in the industrial world, where, "each according to his ability and all according to their need," receive the benefits of production and consumption, still no true man would be satisfied with bare justice. *There must be a reciprocity of manhood as well as of dollars before we can look for social peace.* To give a man his wages and refuse him respect, will not satisfy for long. To establish a public bath by the writing of a liberal check and then to write with the same pen a supercilious article on "the lower classes" is a contradiction in form, if not in spirit, which will not be tolerated. To give a man his price of labor and not your praise of his workmanship is withholding the truest and most pleasing incentive to toil. Better than dividing your fortune, is the distribution of manly sympathy. It is the invisible part of your estate, the part which the law, or the strike, can not touch, which the workingman really craves. I know they repudiate charity and demand, in their platforms, "mere justice," but all the while, they want something much richer and truer than simple justice. Justice does not cast out envy and jealousy. Among millionaires greed and hate are no strangers. Equal wealth is no defense against civil and moral distraction. The labor problem is pre-eminently a moral problem. It is a cry for the recognition of the essential *manhood* of every true worker in every sphere of life. The present conflict is not between labor and capital but between laborers and capitalists. Now, it is to this fundamental need that Christian fellowship directs its beneficent power. "One Father, one blood, one duty." With these words emblazoned on its banner it leads the world's teachers and philanthropists, its educators and artisans, its foremen and managers, its superintendents and boards of directors into that larger justice which is sometimes mercy but always love.

I wish, in the second place, to show the centrality of Christian fellowship in all movements towards a better civic order and morale. Municipal pride and economical taxation may arouse to spasmodic reform. Revelations of corrupt official life have

shocked us into moral consciousness. Huge steals by bibulous aldermen and interested councilmen may cause us to rally around the public treasury, but neither civic pride nor a rifled corporation furnish a heroic or continuous motive in the fight for law and order. It is not institutions but men that most need saving. It is because such abuse of office breeds moral rot, in every avenue of public and private life, that we seek to reform an administration or an institution. I am sure our civil war took on nobler proportions when, added to the purpose of preserving the Union, it became a battle for the rights of man—the liberation of four million slaves. It is because the city exists for man, not man for the city, that the arousalment of the public conscience is such a splendid event in our national life. We Americans must never forget who has been our prophet in this new crusade. It is a man fired by Christian faith and determination. Parkhurst is first and foremost a lover of men, this makes him invincible in his fight for probity and decency in the administration of public trusts. It is not until we love *men* supremely that we can conquer our fear and sloth and march forth to retake the citadel of public justice. Christian fellowship answers the question "who is my neighbor" by declaring "every tempted boy and tremulous girl, every unfortunate of the street and asylum, every lodger in our tenement houses and majestic avenues, every bullied apple-woman and garment worker, every boss-taxed clerk and harried millionaire." What are clean, smooth pavements worth save as related to man's health and easy walk? What are wharves and piers save as they make easy access for the cheapest food for the citizen? What significance has electric plant and water supply save as they guide and refresh the homeward bound and thirsty? Why build the stately palaces of state, if not to impress the sense of reverence for law and order? Why paint our pictures and rear our art galleries, if not to call out man's latent power of observation and love of beauty? Why construct our noble cathedrals, unless to tell the story of man's unquenchable aspiration for the beauty of holiness? Man, man! back of all sciences, arts, and institutions is what gives vigor and value to all our toil and heroisms. The truest patriotism is bred

of Christian fellowship. Back of so much dirt and rock, streets and houses, charters and constitutions, stands a *human* history made by men of our own blood and hue, whose lives are our heritage calling out our reverence and love and devotion to the aims and institutions they bequeathed. Well may Taylor sing:

"The bravest are the tenderest
The loving are the daring."

May I mention another realm of thought and action where fellowship holds the central place in the coördination of our divided forces. I refer to the Christian Church. A union of the sects of Christendom, or a synthesis of their various confessions is, in my own mind, a waning belief. I am still hoping against hope. There stands, however, that prayer of Christ: "That they all may be one." So long as that prayer stands in Holy Scripture, so long I am compelled to help actualize the spiritual oneness of all believers. I am not sure just what he means. Good men tell us it means organic union, having one institution and that organized on the Episcopal plan. Well, I am ready for that, provided the episcopus is not an arrant autocrat and the historic presbyterate and historic congregationalism stand with it. But would any form of Church organization make us one in Christ Jesus? No, we need something more than polity. Some scholars would carry us back of all our denominational history and creed-making and put us down in the first century of the Church and bid us be satisfied with the confession of the first disciples. But what was that confession, and, if we had it, would that insure Christian unity? No, not so long as men are born with their varied mental and emotional tendencies. There is something more precious than uniformity and that is Christian liberty. What, then, must be the central power for the unifying of church activity? One thing is certain, we must have more *Christian* unity before we dare expect more church unity. Here our cherished power of love which is considerate, humble, gentle, forgiving, generous, and full of faith is the dominant factor in the coördinating of individual churchmen. It is to the men of this large Christian love in all the denominations, and not to the narrow ecclesiastics, that we look for that spiritual

unity contemplated by Jesus. "For Christ" first, for "The Church" second, for my denomination last. This has been the historical, and must be the affectional order, if we are really serious about the union of Christendom. One thing is certain, where there is constant rancor and self-assertion there can be no Christ. The faith once delivered to the saints was not an elaborated creed, or a hierarchy of spiritual prerogatives, but an abounding trust in Jesus Christ, as the Saviour and Master of all mankind. I glory in my Lutheranism because I believe it to be a pure Paulinism and Paul the largest and truest interpreter of Christ. Love is the coördinating principle. The nearer we get to Christ the closer will we come to one another. *We must have a confederacy of the churches before we can have a unification of the Church.*

The last sphere to be mentioned in which I believe Christian love must be made the central and controlling motive of action is in the individual life. Whether it be a system of theology, or a single Christian life that is to tell for God, the love of God in Christ Jesus must be put at the core of the structure. The doctrine of the incarnation has taken on new significance in our age because the recovered Christ has been seen to be the personalization of God's love. Among the Christian graces Paul makes charity, or love, supreme. Above the faith which clings to Christ for redemption, beyond the hope which strains its prophetic eye into the age of the completed kingdom, stands the constraining power of love. Love—which suffereth long and is kind, love which envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, love which endureth all things and never faileth. Prophecies may fail, tongues may cease, knowledge shall vanish away, but love shall abide triumphant over every ill and sorrow of life. What force is more needed in our daily lives than just this divine attribute. If men were ruled by this principle in the marts of trade, in the realm of science, in the home, in the Church, in the university, on the play-ground, in the social circle, what a revolution would be accomplished, how like a new Eden this old brutal world would soon become. "A little child shall lead them." The day seems far off as yet. The vast standing

armies of Europe, the struggle for existence among the masses of men, the ruthless licentiousness among all classes, the wasteful luxury among the unemployed rich and improvident poor, the blank materialism among so many, the reckless race for power among our political aspirants, seem to be all too resistless a combination to be halted and subdued by anything short of the Archangel Michael himself. But we hold by our central principle—"not by might, nor by power but by my word saith the Lord of Hosts." Let us bring all our learning, all our discovery, all our art, all our science, all our legislation, all our poetry, to this central figure of love. Let her firm warm hand be laid in consecration on all your talents and opportunities and struggles. Let her lips rest upon your brow before you go forth to the battle of life. In her name Paul, John, Jesus won their glorious triumphs over Pharisaism, Grecian thought, and Satan's power. By love's power, the gory Forum of Nero was closed and Cæsar's palace captured. By love's might, the German forests were pierced and made vocal with Christian song, By love's venture, England's isles were redeemed from brutal butcheries and darksome faiths. By love's propulsion, out into East, West, North and South the heralds of the cross have gone to bring civilization and joy to haunts of vice and pestilence. By love's might, Christ came down and bore in his uplifted hands a whole world's sin up to the pardoning throne of God. And ever since, in nursery and on battlefield the thrill of his redeeming love has given nerve and faith to mother love and manhood's noblest sacrifice. "An affection costs more than an idea. The secret of Christian success is passion." A theology that results in your hating another follower of Christ is a devil's theology, whether it be taught by Romish or Protestant divine. I remember standing before the altar of Westminster Abbey. Behind that altar were the tombs of England's illustrious kings and queens—the shrine of Edward and the chapel where the body of Henry of Agincourt sleeps its glorious sleep. To my left, in the north transept, were the marble statues of England's great statesmen and naval heroes. Turning toward the south transept, the tab-

lets and busts of "poets' corner" recalled the pilgrims of Chaucer, the immortal dramas of Shakespeare and the heroics of Milton. Standing in the north aisle of the abbey, one looks upon the two floor-slabs which bear the names of Darwin and of Livingstone, the monuments to Harvey and to Pitt. Down the main aisle, as we approach once more the altar, bard, soldier, musician, actor, physicist, and philanthropist, in silent effigy, look down upon us. Around and above us rear, in sculptured symmetry, a forrest of stone columns and overarching traceries. The music of the great organ commenced to move and swell into every bay and nook of the ancient minster. Slowly and unconsciously our eyes turned towards the very centre, and heart of this vast mausoleum of the world's great masters—the reredos behind the altar. There, painted with his first disciples, stood the figure of the man of Galilee with hands outstretched to bless and to command the inmates of that vast cathedral. Yes, he was, and is the true centre of the world's best thought and life. His the commanding presence in all noble action and discovery. That uplifted face, in the centre of the world's history, gives significance to every war and constitution, every grief and joy, every struggle for the emancipation of man, every poem and oratorio, every love and hate, every drama acted and king dethroned, every passion conquered and every prayer wrung from the heart of stricken men. Here, at last, in his life, we have found the creative centre of all loves and divine fellowships.

ARTICLE VII.

THE BIBLE AND ITS EXPOSITORS.

BY PROF. LUTHER A. FOX, D. D.

The subject is too broad for one discourse. A brief paper* must be limited to some particular feature, and not even then can there be an exhaustive discussion.

The Bible is the inspired record of the revelations of God. It was written in different ages, in different languages, with different proximate purposes, but in all its parts it is addressed to the common people with the ultimate aim of leading men to a true relation to God. Each book grew out of special circumstances, yet taken together they contain the most important truth known to men, and deal with eternal relations. To be understood, each writer and each age with its peculiar circumstances and the immediate design of each book must be studied. It is a book for the people, yet it needs interpretation. The unlettered reader may understand it, yet the profoundest theologian is not able to sound all the depths of its meaning. It needs exposition.

Every minister should be his own interpreter. Second-hand learning is always bad, but worst of all in him who would carry the word of God to the hearts of men. The truth must come fresh from his own heart and brain that it may go burning into the brains and hearts of the people. Too much use may be made of commentaries. He who reads his Bible only through the eyes of others reads oft amiss and abuses that which ought to be invaluable help.

The minister should study the Bible for a threefold purpose. He should study it for the cultivation of his own piety. He should study it also for enlarging his general fund of knowledge without any direct reference to his work. And last he

*A paper read before the Ministers' Section of the Southern Biblical Assembly at Ashville, N. C.

should study it for use in his regular ministrations. Too often the last use is made the chief one.

The minister as an interpreter of the Scriptures needs first of all the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. The old Puritan divines emphasized this fact and carried it sometimes into extravagance, but there was a most important truth lying at the basis of their conception. To understand a book there must be sympathy with its spirit and nature. Unpoetic natures can not comprehend true poetry. So an unreligious mind and heart can not understand the Bible. Rationalists have done good work in textual criticism, but their service as commentators has been altogether negative. But by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit in the study of the Scriptures something more is meant than a religious spirit. The Bible is an inspired book. We must give up the old theory of dictation, correctly termed mechanical, but we must hold on to the doctrine of inspiration as an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit upon the sacred writers. It is much more than the inspiration of religious genius. The Bible contains the word of God, but it is more. Its composition, its preservation, and its purpose make it the word of God. It is a miracle as well as the record of a miracle. It is God's book. Of the Bible as well as of Providence it may be said :

"God is his own interpreter
And he will make it plain."

The Spirit who inspired it abides in the Church as the guide into all truth. He makes no new revelations but he illuminates that we may understand the revelation already made. He is freely given to those who ask for him. He who prays best studies best. A minister with a teachable heart enlightened by the Holy Spirit will get without commentaries not only much nearer the heart of the word, but also much profounder conceptions of it, than one with the best commentaries but without submission of heart and mind to the influence of the Spirit. The Holy Ghost is the best of all expositors.

The Bible was written for the people. The minister, not only as a teacher, but also for the understanding of the Scripture, needs

a thorough sympathy with the habits of thought and feeling and the forms of expression found among the masses. Luther's translation is one of the best ever made into any language, because he maintained a knowledge of the common people. Sometimes Melancthon would help to understand a construction and sometimes a laborer would help to catch a popular expression. Critics and theologians sometimes miss the real meaning of texts because they have drifted too far away from the people. One of the great difficulties in understanding the older portions of the Bible is that of realizing the intellectual conditions of the people when they were written. We all understand that it was a popular representation to an infantile nation when it is said God repented that he had made man, but the imagination having failed to construe fully the condition of the people in that age we lose sight of one principle of interpretation when we come to read that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, and instead of an indirect result we see a direct influence, or when we read that the sons of God were seduced by the daughters of men, instead of the sons of Seth we find angels marrying women. Perhaps too many things have been construed too literally, as the description of the fall of man. The profounder meanings of all parts of the Bible grow out of the popular sense. The depths of the Bible lie in the relations of the truths which the common people see. If we miss the popular meaning we miss all. The minister who would understand for himself the Bible, must have companionship on the one hand with the learned and on the other with the masses.

A necessary part of the equipment of every minister for the study of the Bible is good translations. He must have besides the Authorized the Revised Version. The old King James Bible, hallowed by the use of so many years in the Church and made dear to our hearts as our mother's Bible, was made before the discovery of the most important MSS., before the careful collation and examination of ancient translations and patristic quotations and before the beginning of modern criticism. It was based upon an imperfect text. It has many obsolete words and phrases, some artificial distinctions and some confusions of

real differences, some inadequate renderings and some misleading translations. The Revised Version gives us the result of the ripest scholarship and puts us in possession of a translation of a text that approximates closely the original. He will find help in other translations like that of Luther and Conybeare and Howson's epistles of Paul. The best commentary is a faithful translation.

But the minister as an interpreter can not stop with translations. He must be able to read the Bible in the original text. He needs a good knowledge of Biblical languages. No translation can embody the various shades of meaning and bring out the whole force of the original. The effort to translate for himself seizes the collateral ideas which no version can represent. But the duties of a pastor will not permit him to prosecute extensively philological studies and it is impossible for him to be as critical as one who gives his main energies to the study of language. He can only hope to have such knowledge as will enable him to understand the work of the specialist and form an opinion of his own. Here comes first the need of a good commentary to bring out the peculiar meanings of words and peculiar constructions of the sacred writers and furnish him facts for his own judgment. The freer from dogmatic prepossessions and the more closely he confines himself to his philological work the more helpful the critical commentator will be.

The Bible, growing out of the circumstances of the people of a peculiar nation in different ages, has repeated references to domestic and social customs among the Jews, to civil and religious institutions, to the history of cotemporaneous nations, and to the geography and zoology and botany of Bible lands. The minister needs for the understanding of the Scriptures a good knowledge of Biblical Archæology. There are passages which lose all their force to one ignorant of oriental customs. The geography of the country would seem to be of the least importance, but it has been said by a great scholar that Bible lands are the best commentary on the Bible, and that a visit to the Holy Land will make a deeper impression and be of more value for sermonizing than many commentaries." Even the geology

of these lands will furnish the most unexpected confirmations and illustrations of the Scriptures. Most of us cannot go there but we can so acquaint ourselves with the best books of travel as to be able to have them for ready reference. The importance of Robinson and Thompson is well known. Lynch, Bartlett and even Mark Twain will be found useful. Principal Dawson's geology of Bible Lands is very valuable. On Archæology in general we have besides Kitto and Smith's dictionaries and Horne's Introduction, Jahn, Ewald and Schurer. Dr. Nevins' little book will also be useful.

A knowledge of ancient history is of importance to the understanding of the Old Testament. To one ignorant of the cotemporaneous history the historical and several of the prophetic books are sealed. Jeremiah or Isaiah read in the light of history has a new meaning. Good commentaries will supply to some extent historic explanations but the explanation is not understood by one who has not a knowledge of at least the outlines of history. A good manual of history like Fisher's is necessary. Histories, with reference to sacred history, like Rawlinson's Egypt, are the best. Prideaux's Connection is still useful.

But the minister cannot be a specialist. He must have the benefit of the labors of those who devote themselves to the profoundest researches on particular lines. He must have commentaries, and he wants the best. Commentaries are divided according to their aim into critical and popular, and according to the nature of the work into philological, theological and homiletical or practical. The ideal commentary would combine all these features, but it is not realized and we must have several, selected with reference to a single feature. We need several also for comparison. But we do not forget that not many pastors' salaries allow so large an outlay for a particular class of books nor his time permit him to study more than one or two. He will find one most helpful and he will confine his work more and more to it using the others only for occasional reference. One well studied, though it is not the best, will be more useful than many of the best just dipped into.

On the whole Bible, for devotional use, Matthew Henry with his "fresh, pithy quaint expression and his rich spiritual wisdom" is among the very best. For critical study Lange's has been pronounced "by far the most learned and comprehensive commentary on the whole Bible that has appeared in modern times." Jamison, Fausset and Brown's is one of the best popular works. The Speaker's Commentary, lately called Bible commentary, is regarded as helpful by those who have used it. On the Old Testament Kiel and Delitzsch is by far the best. On the New Testament Bengel and Meyer are indispensable. Calvin's remains valuable, Alford and Ellicott are useful. Meyer has supplanted Olshausen because it has utilized the most recent science. It is the best for philological exegesis. Among the more recent excellent popular commentaries, combining as Jamison, Fausset and Brown a considerable amount of critical study, we may mention, The International Illustrated Commentary, edited by Dr. Schaff, and the Lutheran Commentary issued by the Christian Literature Company and edited by Dr. Jacobs. Commentaries on single books are too numerous to be noticed here.

We may conclude with a brief statement of important rules for the study of any given section. 1. Read carefully in the original. 2. Read it in Revised Version. 3. In other translations. 4. Study it in a critical commentary. 5. Read a practical commentary. 6. Study it in all its historical and archaeological relations. 7. Make it a part of your own religious life. 8. Begin and close the study upon your knees.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEA OF PROPITIATION.

BY PROF. ANDREW G. VOIGT, D. D.

In a former article the writer examined into the New Testament idea of reconciliation as it appears from the words denoting that idea. The result of that inquiry was that reconciliation according to the language of the New Testament was not merely a subjective moral change within man, but an objective change or relation between man and God; that this change was effected by a vicarious satisfaction rendered to God by Jesus Christ; and that therefore it was not incorrect to speak of reconciling God in theology, although this form of expression is not used in the New Testament.

In this article the writer proposes to examine into the New Testament usage in regard to the terms that denote *propitiation*. This line of inquiry leads to a result in no way contradictory to that arrived at from the study of the words expressing the idea of reconciliation. The conclusion will perhaps not be as full and as definite as in the case of the study on reconciliation. But that is because the number of instances which furnish material for this investigation is fewer. For the passages in which words like *propitiation* occur in the New Testament are comparatively few.

The words and passages which will be discussed in this article are the following: *Hilaskesthai*, found in Luke 18 : 13; Heb. 2 : 17. *Hilasmus*, found in 1 John 2 : 2; 4 : 10. *Hilasterion*, used in Rom. 3 : 25; Heb. 9 : 5.

In an inquiry of the kind we are here pursuing, it is proper to begin with those instances in which there is the least danger of dogmatic preconceptions asserting themselves. For this reason we begin with the passage, Luke 18 : 13, where the word *hilaskesthai* is used in quite a general sense. It is in the parable of the

pharisee and publican. In the prayer of the latter where the English translation has, "God be merciful unto me," the margin of the R. V. properly explains that a more literal rendering is, "God be propitiated unto me." If in the study of New Testament words generally, the study of the Old Testament antecedents is important, it is especially so with regard to the word now under consideration. Doubtless the verb in the publican's prayer represents some Hebrew verb like *salach*. The prayer is quite general. There is no distinctly sacrificial allusion in it. Therefore the Greek verb used probably does not stand for the technical term of the Old Testament signifying "to make propitiation," the Hebrew *kapper*. The publican's prayer is simply a petition that God's attitude toward the sinner be changed, without indicating in any manner how this change is to be brought about. Certainly it is not merely a subjective change within himself which the publican desired. Surely it is not merely a realizing sense that God *is* merciful which the publican expresses or which he is striving to attain. The real objective relation between God and himself gives him anxiety, and this relation he wishes to have changed, both on God's side and his own. God is to become propitious where before he was otherwise, as the publican realized in the depths of his conscience.

There is no indication of any means, for instance sacrifice, by which this change of relation is to be effected. But the declaration of the result is in some degree suggestive of the mode. It is said that the publican went down to his house *justified*. This is a legal, a judicial term, and its use here indicates that it is not improper to view the relation of the sinner to God as a legal one. There is a disposition at the present time to escape from these legal views and substitute for them what are supposed to be more moral conceptions. We think this is objectionable on other grounds into which we cannot enter here. For our present purpose we contend that we cannot get away from some legal conceptions in the doctrine of the atonement, without departing from the conceptions of the Bible itself. The publican stood before his Judge as an offender. This Judge justified him, that is declared him righteous. By what means the guilt

of the offender was put beyond judgment, and by what means the Judge was made propitious—this is not indicated. It was not pertinent to the teaching of the parable. But evidently the language is such that the idea of an unexpressed factor by which satisfaction was made for the publican, is certainly not contradictory to its tenor.

We would not think of trying to prove the doctrine of a vicarious atonement from the parable of the pharisee and publican. To show that the language of that parable is not contradictory to the doctrine is sufficient. The case is somewhat different in the only other passage in the New Testament in which the verb *hilaskesthai* occurs, Heb. 2 : 17.

Christ is there described as "a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." This language contains a manifest reference to the Mosaic ritual. The verb, translated "to make propitiation" in the English version, evidently represents the technical Hebrew verb for this idea, *kapper*. In the Septuagint the compound *exilakesthai* generally represents this important Hebrew term; but that form does not occur in the New Testament. Before proceeding to define the ideas expressed in the passage now before us, it will be necessary to become clear about some of the sacrificial ideas of the Old Testament, especially those ideas connected with the act of *kapper*.

The general ideas in regard to atonement in the Old Testament are briefly these: God is unapproachable to man without some act of purification. The cause of this is not, as is sometimes contended, merely the separation between God in his majesty and man in his frailty without reference to sin; but the cause is, the sinfulness and impurity of man which makes him unable to endure the presence of the holy God. The sinner is repelled from God by the terror of his wrath. Hence when man comes into the presence of God he needs something to *cover* or *protect* him. Hence the use of the verb *kapper*, meaning to cover. The means of covering or protection against the wrath of God cannot be of man's choosing. God himself prescribes what shall be done. Various acts and means, for example, in-

cense, prayer, may serve to "cover," to make propitiation, but the chief means is the application of blood. The propitiation effected a removal of sin or of impurity.

Where the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews says that Christ made propitiation for the sins of the people as a high-priest, some expiatory act is implied by which the sins were removed. The nature of this expiatory act is plainly stated in the context. At first sight it might seem that it was only by his sympathy, learned from his own temptation and suffering, that Christ made propitiation for men. "It behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren." "In that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." But this sympathy was not the expiatory act which Christ performed; it was not a sacrificial act. The significance of that sympathy was the unity and identity which it brought about between Christ as priest and the people whom he represented. It was only preparatory to the sacrificial act by which propitiation was made. This is plainly declared in 2:11: "For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." The act by which Christ made propitiation, is indicated in 2:14: "That through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death." His death was the means by which he effected deliverance for the people. Hence it was the act in which especially he proved himself a "high-priest in things pertaining to God" (v. 17). We are now brought up to the question, How was the death of Christ an act pertaining to God? Was it a vicarious sacrifice offered to him or not?

In the first place it should be observed that the death of Christ is here represented as having an objective value. It was not only an evidence of sympathy on his part toward sinful men. It effected a deliverance, and this not only by making an impression on men's minds which removed the fear of death; but the deliverance is an actual objective liberation from death by bringing to nought a real objective power of death, the devil. The power of death which the devil exercised must have been for the sins of the people. For Christ's death which nullified

that power, was at the same time an act of propitiation for the sins of the people. But what had God to do with this connection of things? Evidently something, for Christ was a high-priest in things pertaining to God. But the connection is not explicitly stated. However, it is not difficult to supply the missing links in the combination of ideas presented in the second chapter of Hebrews. The people were subjected to him that had the power of death, because God had so subjected them. It was an expression of his wrath against their sins. By his death Christ made a sacrifice which removed the cause of that subjection, averted the wrath of God, made propitiation for the sins of the people and satisfied the demands which God had against them. This he did by taking the place of the people as their priest and at the same time as their offering in his death. So he tasted death for every man (Heb. 2 : 9).

We conclude that "to make propitiation" in Heb. 2 : 17 means to make a vicarious sacrifice which averts the wrath of God by satisfying the demands of his holiness against the sinner.

The noun *Hilasmos*, "propitiation," is not found in the New Testament except in two places in the first epistle of John. In the first of these two passages Jesus Christ is called the propitiation for our sins (2 : 2). This language is plainly sacrificial. The apostle is explaining the ground of consolation and peace, "if any man sin." He is not speaking of men generally, but of those who have fellowship with the Father. The possibility of their sinning and the disturbing of their fellowship with God thereby is conceived. When such a thing occurred in the Old Testament priestly intercession and acts of propitiation were necessary. So likewise in the New Testament John here declares that the intercessor and the propitiation for the sins of believers, in fact for the sins of the whole world, are already provided. The Paraclete or Advocate is present with the Father. Where we are unrighteous, he is righteous. And his righteousness avails to cover us in our sin, because in his own person he is the means of propitiation for us. In order to be this, he must have been in some way an offering or a sacrifice in our behalf. What that way was is told in ch. 1 : 7 : "The blood of Jesus

his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Blood is the sacrificial means of making atonement thereby cleansing from sin. The person of Christ is a means of propitiation for us because his blood was shed and applied as a sacrifice. His advocacy on our behalf with the Father is based upon this act of propitiation. It would be in vain to have an advocate with the Father if the propitiation had been intended only to influence the conduct of men and not the attitude of the Father. There is evidently in this passage an idea of substitution. Christ puts himself in place of those who sin, and as "the righteous" stands in our stead before God so that our sins are not allowed to break off our fellowship with the Father. But this substitution as our Advocate would be impossible if the propitiation on which the advocacy is based, were not also an act involving the substitution of the sacrifice of Christ for what we should have done to satisfy the demands of God.

The word "propitiation" in 1 John 2:2 contains the vicarious idea; so it does in ch. 4:10: God "sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." This act of God is presented as the manifestation of the highest love, and in this love is the sole ground of our salvation. Cf. v. 9. If we are to live through Christ (and this is declared to be the purpose of sending the Son), it must be through the propitiation which he became for our sins. No love of ours, no subjective change within us effects a propitiation for us; but an objective proceeding. God sending his Son into the world and that Son becoming a sacrifice and thereby a means of propitiation, has obtained life for us instead of the death which our sins merited. As in the Old Testament God provided rites of propitiation to protect his people from the effects of his wrath, so here we find that God sends his Son to be the propitiation for the same purpose.

It is God that sends a substitute to "cover" man. Man does not find this substitute himself. This corresponds with a peculiarity of biblical usage which we noticed in the article on Reconciliation, and which is also characteristic of the words for "to make propitiation" in the Bible. God is not made the object propitiated, just as he is not made the object reconciled.

But it would be very erroneous to infer from this that the propitiation is not designed to influence the attitude and action of God, but only the conduct of men.

There is still another word belonging to the family we are here considering, a word whose precise meaning in the New Testament is not easily determined. That word is *Hilasterion*, found in Rom. 3 : 25 and Heb. 9 : 5. In the latter passage it occurs in an enumeration of the articles of furniture of the Holy of Holies of the Old Testament tabernacle. According to the translation of the Septuagint *hilasterion* represents the Hebrew *kapporeth*, translated "mercy seat" in the Authorized Version. It is a remarkable thing that the Septuagint rendered the Hebrew *kapporeth* by a word containing the idea of propitiation. It shows that in the time when that translation was made, propitiation was in some way ascribed to that piece of furniture in the tabernacle. But whether that was the original idea of the Hebrew term is an unsettled question. *Kapporeth* has been supposed to be derived from the Piel form *kipper*, signifying to expiate or propitiate. But the preponderance of modern opinion favors the simple translation *cover* or *lid*, from the primary idea of the verb *kaphor*. The Revised Version gives "covering" as a marginal rendering, *e. g.* Exod. 25 : 17.

What then was the *kapporeth* in the Old Testament? Primarily, the lid of the ark of testimony or more probably a covering over the lid of the ark. Cf. the description in Exod. 25 : 17-22. In the second place it was the throne of God, the place where he manifested his presence. "There I will meet with thee and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim, which are upon the ark of the testimony," (Exod. 25 : 22). The cherubim everywhere in the Bible represent the powers around the majesty of God. Cf. Psalms 99 : 1. Because of the presence of God the high-priest had to approach the *kapporeth* in a cloud of incense so as not to die at the sight of the divine glory. Cf. Levit. 16 : 13. In the third place the *kapporeth* was a means of propitiation. This is denied by some, but it seems to be a legitimate inference from Levit. 16 : 15, 16. The blood of sacrifice was put upon it not

merely to purify it, but to complete the work of propitiation. Hence the Greek *hilasterion* and the English "mercy seat" are not altogether misnomers.

Such was the article of furniture mentioned in Heb. 9 : 5. But the writer of that epistle makes no special application of the term to Christ, so that we can learn nothing directly of the New Testament idea of propitiation from the passage. But the use of the term in this place serves to establish the biblical usage and thus to create a presumption as to the sense in the difficult passage Rom. 3 : 25.

In our judgment the best translation of this passage is this : "Whom God set forth to be a mercy seat (*kapporeth*) through faith in his blood." The only other interpretation which seems at all admissible is that which renders *hilasterion* by "propitiatory sacrifice." Whichever of these two interpretations is adopted, we must find here an expression of St. Paul's doctrine of atonement.

The apostle is explaining how the righteousness of God was revealed towards men for their justification. It was through a redemption in the person of Christ. This redemption was effected by a propitiatory something, either a propitiatory sacrifice or a propitiatory covering (*kapporeth*) which Christ became by his blood. If he became a sacrifice, it was manifestly in behalf of those who on account of their sins were in need of a propitiation which they could not render themselves. But when their sins were covered by the sacrifice of Christ, the righteousness of God was revealed, which declared their justification, instead of his wrath which declared their condemnation.

But we prefer to think that the apostle represents Christ as in his own person the mercy seat, through which by the application of sacrificial blood propitiation was made. This is not the same thing as representing Christ as the priest who makes atonement, nor as representing him as the sacrifice by efficacy of which it is effected. But the latter idea is inseparable from the use of the mercy seat. Hence the apostle adds : "in his blood." As a mercy seat Christ was set forth before us by God as a place of refuge against our sins and as a place of meeting with God

as his people. Through the means of the mercy seat all who have sinned can approach him without fear of his consuming wrath. Why is the mercy seat such an efficacious means of propitiation? Not because it represents any change within us, but because it represents something done without us by which God chooses to be governed in his dealings, so that he can be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.

On either interpretation of *hilasterion* in Rom. 3:25 the leading thoughts are the same. Propitiation was made by Christ on which a course of action for God is based. A certain thing of God's own appointment had to be done to secure the revelation of his saving righteousness. Certain demands of God had to be satisfied. This vicarious satisfaction Christ made in all its parts, becoming himself priest, offering, mercy seat, everything to make the propitiation complete so that all that was left for man to do was to adopt it by faith and appropriate its benefits. The propitiation is not something to affect the belief and conduct of man, but to alter the relation of God to sinners. When that objective fact was accomplished, then (we are speaking of logical, not temporal order) Christ was set forth before men as the *Kapporeth*, the mercy seat in his blood, so that the new relation, in which God's righteousness for justification is revealed instead of his wrath for condemnation, might become man's by faith.

The use of the idea of propitiation in the New Testament like the use of the idea of reconciliation is pervaded by the thought of vicarious satisfaction.

ARTICLE IX.

MODERN GERMAN THEOLOGY : RITSCHLIANISM.

BY REV. CHR. JENSEN, D. D.

Translated from the German by Rev. Ernst Ortlepp.

"Modern theology" originated in the universities. The late Professor Ritschl, of Göttingen, is chiefly the father of it. The professors teach the students, and thus, as candidates for the ministry, they enter the holy office with this theology. Among the younger ministers there are not a few who are inclined to accept this theological system. Through periodicals and books also these principles and doctrines are promulgated and spread, so that many educated men, like teachers, lawyers, etc., foster their religious ideas under the same trend of thought. In the following paper we shall try to review the fundamental doctrines of our Christian faith in the light of this modern theology. The reader may then judge for himself what dangers are hidden in this system.

I. THE BIBLE, THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints, of which article III. of our catechism treats, accepts what the Scriptures say of themselves: Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; all Scripture was given by inspiration of God; the Scripture cannot be broken; one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. The Holy Scripture, in all its communications is the truth, the everlasting truth; all that is told here of man's sin and the fate of nations happened literally so. The Holy Ghost kept those writers from errors and delusions. All that is communicated of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, of eternity, of redemption through the blood of Jesus, of the judgment, of everlasting bliss for the saved, of everlasting condemnation of the lost *i. e.* of those who have no personal, living faith in Jesus nor accept the salvation, the blood of Jesus, as their ransom: all

this is of eternal truth ; God has *revealed* it all, *he* stands behind his word leading his word to victory. All men are liars, but God will not have it said that, be it in *one* particular, he dealt otherwise than he declared unto men.

Modern theology occupies a different position towards the Scriptures. The Bible originated like any other book. As the Old Testament reports the history of Israel so the New Testament tells us of the beginning of the Christian Church and, because it is the most ancient document, has the greatest value in comparison with other religious writings. But the writers worked with their natural powers and gifts, hence they are apt to err ; they are men of their period which was rich in myths and legends ; they were possessed of Jewish conceptions ; they cherished their own religious ideas. Consequently, the modern theologian speaks of a Johannean, Petrine and Pauline theology ; to him it remains to be seen what Jesus really taught ; in other words, we must find out what is true of the Bible. All errors and myths, all false and incorrect statements as reported by the authors without discrimination, must be expelled. When we ask these modern theologians what, then, will be left of real truth, their answer will consist, perhaps, in shrugging the shoulders. Science must remove the shell in order to detect the kernel of truth ; or, that which has proved itself in the heart ; or, what a majority is ready to recognize as being true. Self-evident it is from such treatment that there can remain no certain truth for us men at all ; in the hands of these modern theologians everything becomes liquid ; one will find somewhat more of truth in the Bible, another somewhat less. One says, *this* my heart has experienced to be the truth ; another replies, no ! I cannot acknowledge this. These gentlemen always pretend they are searching for truth ; frequently they avow that, moved with a sincere longing, they strive after truth and gladly take hold of it where they find it.

Having heard this we deem it but natural that some professors simply deny the conception of Jesus by the Holy Ghost as recorded in the Bible, that certain accounts are called myths, and

that many other portions of the Book of Truth are rejected as Jewish ideas or Johannean and Pauline theology.

"Modern theologians," undoubtedly, *speaking* of a word of God, but in reality they have no word of God any more, no, *not in the sense of our faithful fathers*, that is, of the one Christian Church, the *Communion of Saints*; they have a *human word* only.

II. THE TRIUNE GOD.

The Church, the communion of saints, believes in one God of three holy persons: God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. Each person exists separately, yet none of these persons is less God; they are from eternity of equal power and holiness. This one divine being is inseparable, invisible, and is the creator and preserver of all things, the visible or invisible.

This faith is accepted by the whole Christian Church, the Catholic as well as the Evangelical. Asking whence the Church obtains this belief the answer must be that she believes the Holy Scriptures in all humility. In the Scriptures we read that God has *created* the world, but at the same time, that all things in heaven and in earth were made by the Son, and that without him not anything was made (Heb. 1 : 2; Col. 1 : 16). Together with the Father and Son the Holy Ghost has been active in the work of creation. Not only in Gen. 1 : 2 we read that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters on that first morning of creation, but also the Psalmist says, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth," (Ps. 33 : 6).

The Scriptures tell us of the *redemption of mankind, lost in sin*. God the Father decreed the redemption; this redemption was completed by Jesus Christ in whom we have redemption through his blood; the appropriation of this redemption is accomplished by the Holy Ghost. The same eternal and Holy Spirit through whom Christ offered himself to God (Heb. 9 : 14) testifies of Jesus in this world of sinners (John 15 : 26) and bears witness with those who believe in Jesus that they are the children of God (Rom. 8 : 16).

The last great work of God concerning earth and men *will be the judgment*. God has decreed to judge all the world with a true and righteous judgment. Yet the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father who hath sent him (John 5 : 22, 23). This judgment, commenced by God in this time already, but completed on the last day, has also some connection with the Holy Ghost. We are besought not to grieve the Holy Spirit of God. The Holy Ghost reproves the world because they believe not in Jesus. Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven (Matt. 12 : 31).

Our God is a triune God. He is the God of revelation and of salvation, the hope of repenting sinners, the terror of careless, worldly-minded men. He is mercy to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and is a consuming fire to the proud. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

The godless world, above all a self-complacent proud science, has always sought to destroy our faith in the triune God; we mention but the Manichæans and Arians of the ancient Church, and the Protestant-Union of modern days. At the present time we meet the Ritschlians and consorts. They have no *triune God* in the sense of the one Holy Christian Church, the communion of saints. Hence the attack upon the Apostles' Creed; hence the open denial of the "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." According to Ritschl's system no educated theologian can call Christ "God;" only in the capacity of a religious Christian is one entitled to call him so; Christ, so they say, has done something superhuman in that he preserved his trust in God through all the temptations and conditions of life; in his substance he is not the eternal God, but concerning his importance to men he can and shall be called a "God." Instead of the living Christ these modern theologians give us the likeness of a so-called *historic Christ* which is found neither in the gospels nor in the epistles of the Holy Scripture, and of whose eternal origin and state after death *we know nothing*.

When the modern theologians speak of the Holy Ghost they do not mean the personal Holy Ghost who, being one with God the Father and the Son, exists separately ; no, they mean that spirit which proceeds from Christ and his doctrine, pervading the Church of all ages. As we are accustomed to speak of the spirit of a nation or of the times so they also speak of a spirit of the Church. As great men cause a certain trend of thought through their intellectual products, and through their books keep such influence alive even after their death, in such a manner Jesus is at work in his Church. This spirit of the Christian community is the Holy Ghost of modern theologians.

But how does Ritschl harmonize all this with the Bible ? Oh ! very well. *Exempla docent.* In John 8 : 58 Jesus says : "Before Abraham was, I am." Ritschl explains : "This sentence is probably not quite intelligible," it was "said to end a discussion, not to establish a dogma." !!

Now, whosoever handles the Word of God in such a manner can easily proceed to the climax where he denies the first and second persons of the preëxisting Godhead. But what a Church is this which tolerates men of such and a similar sort to hold offices as professors for the education of theological students, the future ministers of our Christian congregations as founded on the basis, on the eternal basis of the three Articles ! But comfort ye my people ! For thus saith the Lord God : "Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered : so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day." (Ezek. 34 : 11, 12).

III. THE REVELATION OF GOD.

The Christian Church knows of several revelations of God : in nature and conscience, in the world and through Christ Jesus. When we see a building we perceive that there has been a master who made the design and completed the structure. Thus we stand before the universe, we behold the earth, the sun, the moon, the stars. Out of themselves they did not come into ex-

istence; everything has a cause. God is the originator and architect of the universe. The Church has derived such faith from the Scripture: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," Gen. 1 : 1. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth," Ps. 33 : 6.

God's revelation in the word is met with even on the first pages of the sacred history. After the fall of men God speaks to them. He prophesies of the Redeemer (Gen. 3 : 15); God selected his servant Abraham ordaining his fate. On Mount Horeb Jehovah appears unto Moses in a flame out of the midst of a bush (Exod. 3). From the heights of Sinai God reveals his holy will establishing his law in the Ten Commandments of Moses, by the disposition of angels, written on two tables of stone (Exod. 20). Through the centuries of the old covenant God spake by the prophets at sundry times and in divers manners. The Church, the communion of saints, believes all these records of Scripture; as they are reported, so they are received as being sure and true.

Most perfect, however, was that revelation which took place with the coming of Jesus Christ. God himself, sacrificing his glory and majesty, took upon him the form of a servant. God became a man, the Word was made flesh, our God appeared in the flesh. When Jesus opens his mouth we hear our God addressing us; where Jesus is seen there our God is seen. Jesus, accordingly, is entitled to say, I and the Father are one, he that hath seen me hath seen the Father (Jno. 14 : 9). Jesus, dwelling among mortals, has fulfilled the word of the prophets: "And it shall be said in that day, lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation" (Isai. 25 : 9). Unfailing truth is all what Jesus says, for he is the true God, he watches over his word that it be executed in every particular. Foolish men shall have no cause to accuse him, as though but one of his utterances be not fulfilled.

"Modern theologians" talk a good deal concerning God's revelation but their bombastic phrases must not dazzle the eye, nor

deceive the heart, for speaking of it they mean something else than the Church, the communion of saints. Professor L. Lemme of Heidelberg, shows it clearly on pages 8 and 9 of his pamphlet, "The Principles of Ritschl's Theology, and their Value." The professor says:

"In the Christian religion, according to Christian conception, all is depending on individual communion with the real, living God whom we may love since he first loved us. For according to Christian conception we know God because he makes himself known to us, we know God by reason of his real self-avermment, *i. e.* by reason of revelation. Such an actual self-avermment or revelation of God to mankind does not exist for Ritschl at all, neither a general revelation of God (Acts 14 : 17), nor a special revelation of God in Jesus Christ, as we are not able to discern how Jesus obtained any revelation. Now, as Ritschl and his followers put so great a stress on their deriving the whole of Christian religion from God's revelation in Jesus Christ, I call attention to this deceiving play with an expression so familiar to us: in an absolutely deviating sense they use it as their advertising sign-board; for religion, according to Ritschl, does not and cannot emanate from an objective self-avermment of God simply because, in his opinion, there is none at all. Ritschl rather teaches what Bender frankly pronounced, that, after men have formed their religious conviction the same is, afterwards, traced back to an imagined revelation, and is then erroneously considered as having its origin therein; and Ritschl, therefore, finds in the idea of revelation a perfectly 'corresponding' common characteristic of all religions."

Exactly the same is expressed by Wil. Schmidt, D. D., in his pamphlet, "The Dangers of Ritschl's Theology for the Church." On page 53 we read: "If Christ bears in him the title of the Godhead, but even this title alone and entirely without the meaning which the Church in this relation associates with him; if rather respecting his being born he is not to be distinguished from any man, and if in the whole course of the system a direct, immediate and personal intercourse with God is impossible to man: in which way, then, in what manner did Christ obtain his

revelation? And what guarantees the reliability of his revelation where strongest subjective certainty has no warranty in itself? *Non liquet.*"

This "modern theology" is simply horrible. Finally all is lost in absolute uncertainty, human development and explanation—and this they call revelation! But most atrocious it is that our congregations receive men, nourished with such a theology, to be their ministers.

* * * * *

IV. THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Christian Church, the communion of saints, believes in Jesus Christ; being one with the Father he lived as true God in heaven from eternity. Before Abraham was, he is; he owned the glory of God before the world was (John 17 : 5). Through the ages of the old covenant he was active every now and then, he influenced the history of mankind; these were but introductory steps toward the great work of redemption. In the fulness of the time the Son of God is conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, made under the law.

Jesus Christ is the essential reflection of divine majesty and glory; he is God of God, exalted forever. The testimony of the Scriptures concerning his real Godhead is so plain, clear and exact that the feeble ones cannot err. We refer to the testimony of words and works. God himself is heard from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son." Jesus says, I and the Father are one; the Holy Ghost testifies through the mouth of all the apostles: This is the true God, and eternal life.

Not less evident is the testimony of his works concerning his real Godhead. He not only participated in creation, but all things were made by him (John 1 : 3; Col. 1 : 16; Heb. 1 : 2). Through him redemption was obtained, and the last judgment shall be conducted by him. He has power to forgive all sins and to make sinners become the sons of God. God has given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow (Phil. 2 : 9). All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father; he that honoreth

not the Son honoreth not the Father who has sent him, (John 5 : 23). This Jesus, having died and risen from the dead, sitting at the right hand of the majesty of God, lives from eternity through all eternity. Jesus is our God, a comfort to poor sinners in life and death. If he were not our God he could not be our Saviour and Redeemer.

In this belief our Church is in harmony with the Christian Church of all centuries since the first Christian pentecost. Think of the creeds. The Apostles' Creed, that is the three Articles in Luther's smaller catechism, says: "I believe in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost born of the Virgin Mary." The Nicene Creed says of the Son of God: "Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man." In the third Article of the Augsburg Confession we read: "They likewise teach, that the Son of God assumed human nature, in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, human and divine, inseparably united in unity of person, one Christ, true God and true man, who was born of the Virgin Mary." The same is clearly taught in the Smalcald Articles, in the larger catechism of Dr. Martin Luther, and in the Formula of Concord (*Sol. Declaratio*, VIII, 6).

Modern theology holds a totally different form of faith respecting the person of Jesus. They declare: We know absolutely nothing of him before his birth; he was not conceived by the Holy Ghost; there is no Holy Ghost as believed in by the Church; he came upon the stage of the world like any other man; "he is but an irregular appearance in history;" he is but gradually, not absolutely distinct from the prophets of the Old Covenant. True, in the ranks of modern theologians they speak in beautiful expressions of Jesus "the revelation of God," and of God's perfect manifestation as love, mercy and faithfulness. Aye, they call them even "God," but not in the sense of the *Church*, the communion of saints, but because he has accomplished something superhuman in that he trusted in God through all his various sufferings and struggles of life. Not ac-

ording to his substance, but merely in view of his *value* to us we are allowed to call him God. He died; but about *his resurrection* their opinions differ; some accept it as true, others deny it. Every one may hold what he pleases.

In modern theology Jesus is but a titular God! Shameful and blasphemous this is! Entirely different is this Jesus Christ. He is able to represent noble principles, to establish lofty doctrines, and to be an excellent example, *but he cannot reconcile a lost world to God, his blood cannot cleanse us from all sin.* Concluding this article we think of St. Paul's words in 1 Tim. 6: 20, 21: "*O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called: which some professing, have erred concerning the faith.*" "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!" (Jere. 9).

V. THE WORK OF JESUS.

The work of Jesus is that sacrifice which he as the mediator has offered to God as a reconciliation, and for all men as a redemption from sin. This act of self-sacrifice on Calvary is a suffering, and a voluntary work of Jesus. As a mediator Jesus experienced the hatred, the enmity of the world against his person; but his sufferings were also a divinely appointed lot, and this not so as though God had merely delivered him to the power of the devil and wicked men. God suffers the pain of death to come over him; out of love to a lost mankind he delivers his holy son into fearful judgment and cruel death, God makes him bear his holy wrath against sin. Not only outwardly does Jesus feel the judgment of sin, but also in the depth of his heart; his soul is pierced; in the fullest meaning of the word he is forsaken of God.

But again, the suffering of sin and penalty was a voluntary one. Jesus knew and saw it clearly beforehand, every moment he could have escaped it all; but he suffered patiently the flames of divine wrath to surround and overwhelm him. He saw God's image in man, though destroyed, and his pitying love moved

him to offer himself in obedience to God, bearing the penalty which men had deserved.

This act of self-sacrifice for men gains its significance in this person which is Jesus. For in the whole sense of the term Jesus is God-man. Jesus is the second person in the triune life of God by whom men were made. The self-sacrifice of Jesus, therefore, is a divine one. The poet has a right to say: "Oh! dreadful sight, my God has died!"

Otherwise Jesus is a man. He is one of us, a real, true man; he belongs to mankind; he stands there as a natural organic member of the human race, the only pure and guiltless member! He is our brother, therefore he feels as a man in his innermost life. As such he becomes the substitute of mankind, their representative before God. His works and sufferings, his death and burial are substitutional; but not as though that which he suffers were something strange and remote from what men were to suffer, so that his sufferings have merely taken the place of ours; no, no, Jesus suffers and dies as the representative of mankind. He offers the sacrifice in the name of his fellowmen, his brethren. The death of Jesus is that substitutional sacrifice which was offered in behalf of all mankind.

The work of Jesus on Calvary, his self-sacrifice, is a satisfaction, atonement and reconciliation. The declaration of the second article comprises the whole work of Jesus in these words: "He has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, secured and delivered me from all sins, from death and from the power of the devil, not with silver and gold, but with his holy and precious blood, and with his innocent sufferings and death."

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments testify to what we here have written. Isaiah prophesies: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed," (53 : 5). Jesus says: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," (Matt. 20 : 28). According to Rom. 5 : 6 and 8 Jesus died for the godless. At the basis of this declaration we find again the thought of substitution.

In all the books of the New Testament we read the same. In the revelation of St. John it is said: "Those that are saved have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Therefore the believing church sings:

"My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus' blood and righteousness;
On Christ the solid rock, I stand;
All other ground is sinking sand."

Modern theology comprehends the work of Jesus otherwise. According to it Jesus announced to the world that God is love, and is not angry at all; he conquered the world, he kept faith in God through all temptations, he sealed his faithfulness with his own death; thus he shows us how we shall act and live, how we can hold our confidence in God through all the changes of life.

But what do modern theologians think of the Church's songs and hymns? Ritschl says: "The proper hymn for a congregation to celebrate our redemption through Christ must be made yet." Ritschl declares that hymn,

"Of what, my Jesus, hast thou been convicted,
That this dread judgment be on thee inflicted"

as being out of place in church on Good Friday, and according to Ritschl that other hymn,

"O Sacred Head, now wounded,"

does not testify at all of the general reconciliation of the believing through Christ's death.

But what is Ritschl doing with the clear and plain declarations of the Scriptures? Behold, and see how easy it is to him. Here is Isaiah 53; Ritschl claims that this passage has no connection with the body of prophecies. Here is Mark 10:45 with the declaration of a ransom for many. Ritschl simply asks: Is it proved at all that the writers paid a direct attention to this expression? We find the same again in 1 Tim. 2:6; but this Epistle, according to Ritschl, is not genuine, not written by Paul. Aye, Ritschl dissolves each passage, which is speaking of the substitutional sufferings of Christ, into its contrary.

The fundamental doctrine of the Evangelical Church is that

man is justified by grace through faith in the blood shed for him on Calvary. This doctrine is radically rejected by this modern theology; it undergoes changes which possibly convert it into the very contrary. The Catholics, even the Greek Catholics, are nearer to us than these modern pagan professors who mingle their philosophic theorems with Christian thoughts and ideas. But always this question comes back to us: What shall become of the Church, of the congregations, if our ministers are not trained anymore in the old faith? Let us but wait: *The judgments of God will not, no, never, fail to materialize.*

We think of the word: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again: the Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing, to fall into the hands of the living God," (Heb. 10 : 28-31).

VI. ETERNITY.

Our life must be considered in respect to this time and to eternity. This time is to prepare our souls for our final condition in eternity. Time is ended after a few short days, or years; eternity has no end. Therefore the Scriptures again and again admonish us to work out the salvation of our souls. What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? That rich man who intended to build larger barns, and said to his soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry, heard the voice of his God, saying, "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided."

Jesus Christ has come to earth and has redeemed mankind through his death in order to save souls for eternity. He is desirous to save men from sin, death and the power of the devil, to win them for his everlasting bliss in heaven. Paul has writ-

ten: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," (1 Cor. 15 : 19). Luther says that every third word of Jesus treats of eternal life. Eternal life and bliss, the kingdom of heaven in the light above, the resurrection from the dead—all this forms the eternal background of the words and works of Jesus. His name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. Simeon will gladly die, for his eyes have seen the Saviour; Paul has a desire to depart, and to be with Christ! The same thought is found in the songs and hymns of the Church sung by the believing of all centuries:

"To save my soul for yonder bliss,
To follow after righteousness,
Is here my holiest calling.
Eternity, thou word so fierce,
Thou sword, the sinful soul to pierce,
Beginning without ending!"

Aye, the bliss of eternity, the rest remaining to the people of God, is the comfort and longing of all believing Christians in their manifold cares and troubles of life; aye, these heavenly realities strengthen our tired heart in the fiery trials of this time, in hours of sickness, or at the graves of our beloved ones. How poor, how vain is this world without a bright eternity before us, revealed through the resurrection of Jesus, assured to believing by the Holy Ghost in the word of God.

There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign;
Infinite day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain.

It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body, (1 Cor. 15 : 42-44).

What does modern theology teach concerning eternity? They declare, we know nothing of it; our aim is in the present life of this earth; we are to subdue the world; even the life in saloons, dancing, playing at cards, all things must be ennobled. To speak about saving the souls for eternity is a pietistic fanaticism; heaven and hell, bliss and damnation are after all but empty phan-

toms to frighten us. Some of our readers, perhaps, may deem this *to be impossible*. Let us hear a safe witness concerning this side of modern theology. Prof. Lemme, D. D., in his pamphlet, "The Principles of Ritschl's Theology, and their Value," says on pp. 47, 48 and 49:

"The very existence of Christianity as the absolute religion and as the religion of the world is depending on the hope and surety of eternity. The individual continuation of the believing after death as founded in Christ and warranted by the Holy Ghost, is just as inalienable as the thought of a future judgment and as the contrast between heaven and hell. All this has disappeared in Ritschl's theology; there is no mentioning any more of individual continuation, of final judgment, of heaven and hell; the background of eternity is torn away from religion.

"Perhaps somebody replies by saying that Ritschl does not deny immortality; indeed, he is very cautious in this respect. But in this important matter it is not so much the question what he does not deny, but what he actually teaches. Now Ritschl sees in the fixation of a future eternal life only an essentially erroneous view; this error invaded ancient Christianity and has governed the Middle Ages, and the reformers, under the influence of mediæval conceptions, were unable to get rid of this erroneous view. According to him only that which bears some relation to the world and the human life deserves consideration, thus altering the sphere of present experiences. Christ himself gives to his whole work a relation to the saving of souls for a future happy life in eternity. Paul gives the fundamental religious sentiment of the New-testamental community, and he contrasts this sentiment with the spasmodic philosophical denials of the resurrection, when he says: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," (1 Cor. 15: 19). Thus it is evident that the existence or non-existence of Christianity depends on this Christian hope and that the destruction of this eternal aim means the destruction of Christianity. Now in that Ritschl's explanations transplant the eternal life and bliss into this time he actually removes the heaven of our Christian belief.

"Now it is self-evident that this breach with a future world must be of far-reaching consequences; consequences which are plain to every sensible person: anything in Christianity which reaches beyond the sphere of time, as, the Holy Ghost, regeneration, individual communion with God and Jesus Christ, even the kingdom of God, must fall in modern theology because of the elimination of the next world. Certainly, those terms are retained—as empty shells. The Holy Ghost is reduced to the spiritual atmosphere of Christendom in that he is defined as the common spirit in which the members of the community gain their common knowledge of God, their common aspirations for the kingdom of God and for the sonship of God. Regeneration is reduced to the formation of moral sentiments and Christian views of the world as they are consummated in the members of Christendom. A certain communion with God is taking place in so far as under the influence of Christ's doctrine the belief in divine providence becomes active in the Christian heart. But an individual living communion with God is, to Ritschl, an imaginary private attitude towards God bearing the characteristics of mediæval piety; especially a vital relation to the exalted Saviour, such as Paul and John experienced, knew and taught, is to Ritschl an imagination, a delusive phantasm. The love to Christ which alone, according to Jesus' own statements, is the perfection of discipleship, is to Ritschl a pietistic sentimentality which can be no Christian command in spite of John 21 : 15; 1 John 4 : 19; Eph. 6 : 24. According to Ritschl, the kingdom of God is an organization of an essentially Old-testamental conception, putting men under moral obligations."

VII. CONCLUSION.

From all the foregoing it will be seen that modern theology preaches a gospel different from that of the Bible, from that that was committed to the Church by our exalted Lord and Saviour; there is no similarity any more between those two. If we had to do with a different conception of secondary, peripheric things only, we could pity such deviations and mistakes, but between

the Church and this modern theology there is absolutely no bridge, no connection any more. We think of Paul's words: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed," (Gal. 1 : 8, 9). Paul uttered no empty babble; they are true words, they contain realities. Pondering such facts, horror may seize a man.

Another thing should be added. The devil is the father of lies. Where there are lies there is the dominion of the devil. It appears to be quite incomprehensible how these disciples of modern theology can employ ecclesiastical terms at the altar and in their sermons whilst they associate with them perfectly strange ideas; they speak of redemption, reconciliation, regeneration, the Holy Ghost, the resurrection, etc., but mean something widely different from what the Church hitherto has believed, as we heard before, Prof. Lemme says: the terms are retained—as empty shells. The Holy Ghost is reduced to the spiritual atmosphere of Christianity; regeneration is reduced to the general sentiment and Christian view of the world; the redeeming death of Christ becomes the "seal" of his "faithful career," etc.

One of the treatises on modern theology likens this inner falsehood to a merchant's store where the cases bear pretentious inscriptions, but when opened they are empty. Of Prof. Harnack we learn that he is going to sever himself from the old forms, to create new forms for new ideas. This is something like fairness; we will esteem this man if he carries out his purpose. The congregations could then see the ravening wolves, which now come in sheep's clothing, so that they be not known.

One question forces itself into our mind: Do the ecclesiastical authorities know nothing of all this? Certainly they do; they are not so ignorant as all that. Therefore it is now their duty to testify openly against this danger. *It will not be without results.* Many do not deem this matter to be dangerous, they speak of mere theological views which one may favor more

or less, but which all are entitled to express. They imagine that the orthodox, especially the pietists, are not able to comprehend the standpoint of modern theologians; but they think so only because they know not the mystery of the gospel of Jesus, nor have proved it in their conscience; because they suffered shipwreck in their faith; or perhaps because they themselves are infected with Ritschlian tendencies.

What of the future? We can but imagine it. Our Lord Jesus is always able to interfere with an almighty hand. But at present it seems as though a large portion of the Church were hastening towards decay, and this, as the result of the dominion of these modern theologians in our universities. Home Missions begin to be more active. The number of believing people is growing under the blessed work of Home Missions and under the care of positive faithful pastors; a vital division goes through the congregations: Here Church, here world! Anarchism receives a large portion of the world. The war against the Church of Christ begins to be fiercer and fiercer. What times may yet come! Who knows? But we despair not!

In our own strength can naught be done—
Our loss were soon effected;
There fights for us the Proper One,
By God himself elected.
Ask you who frees us?
It is Christ Jesus—
The Lord Sabaoth,
There is no other God;
He'll hold the field of battle.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

How to Read the Prophets. Being the Prophecies arranged Chronologically in their historical setting with Explanations, Maps and Glossary. By Rev. Buchanan Blake, B. D., author of "How to read Isaiah. Price \$1.50 per vol.

This work consisting of five small volumes each containing about 250 pp. is not designed for scholars, who have lying to hand the necessary apparatus for such an arrangement and understanding of the prophets as is here proposed, but it is designed for popular use as an aid in the general reading of the Scriptures. It adapts the methods of scholars to the need of the ordinary student. It is not a detailed verse by verse Commentary, all chapter and verse divisions are removed, but it is an effort, and an admirably successful one, to get at the primary application of the prophet's words, to place them in such connection with his own time that the prophet may speak for himself.

The fact has been largely overlooked that the prophet had in the first instance a message to his contemporaries. He announced the mind and will of God to his own generation. The distinct and original and immediate application of his message must accordingly first of all be sought in his own conditions, in the historic surroundings when these prophecies were announced. How was the prophecy understood when first delivered, and by the people to whom it was delivered, is the first problem to be solved by an intelligent study of the Scriptures. To seek for the future fulfilment of a prophecy without any reference to its primary application is to subject Holy Writ to arbitrary violence and to disqualify ourselves for apprehending the original sense and the fulness of meaning which attaches to it.

The haphazard existing arrangement of the prophets in our Bible is out of all historical connection with the circumstances in which their authors lived. This chronological arrangement of the prophetic books, therefore, bringing within the reach of the many "a clear and succinct presentation of those prophets in their historical environment" is to be most earnestly commended to all who desire a clear and accurate understanding of the inspired word.

Vol. I. contains The Pro-Exilian Minor Prophets, Vol. II. the I. Isaiah, Vol. III. Jeremiah, Vol. IV. Ezekiel, Vol. V. II. Isaiah, Daniel and the Post-Exilian Minor Prophets.

E. J. W.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

The Book of Ezekiel. By Rev. John Skinner, M. A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, Presbyterian College, London. pp. 499.

The Song of Solomon and the Lamentations of Jeremiah. By Walter F. Adeney, M. A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, and Church History, New College, London.

The Book of Jeremiah. Chapters XXI to LII. By W. H. Bennett, M. A., Professor of Old Testament Languages, Hackney and New Colleges, London.

Two of these authors have appeared before in the "Expositor's Bible Series," and all three are worthy members of the goodly company who are giving us some of the rich fruit of their scholarship in the books of this series. The part that will likely call forth dissent, though read with as keen an interest as any other, will be the sixty pages devoted to the Song of Solomon. Nor will Professor Adeney be surprised, for he says (p. 53)—"It is scarcely to be expected that the view of the Song of Solomon expounded in the foregoing pages will meet with acceptance from every reader." But, dissent as the reader may, he will not deny that a very plausible interpretation has been given. The companion volume to Professor Bennett's is the "Book of Jeremiah," embracing the first twenty chapters, by C. J. Ball, M. A., one of the six volumes of the third series, issued in 1889-90.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Quick Truths in Quaint Texts. By Robert Stuart MacArthur. Price, \$1.25; pp. 336.

The author tells us that these sermons were first preached by him in the Calvary Baptist Church, New York, on consecutive summer Sunday evenings, and afterwards in Music Hall, Boston. He thinks "it is often well to tread the unfamiliar by-ways and to visit the comparatively strange regions of the Bible." The title to the volume is justified by the living lessons he finds in his odd texts. It has the air of sensationalism about it, but the contents show that the preacher has not forgotten his mission to preach "Christ and him crucified." We are gratified to learn that a second series will likely be issued.

CHARLES SCRIBNER S SONS, NEW YORK.

Our Western Archipelago. By Henry M. Field.

Dr. Field is so popular and so distinguished a traveler and so pleasing and well known a writer that it seems almost unnecessary to tell the readers of the *QUARTERLY* of the charm of his latest book. We know of no one who writes of travel with the grace and power to hold attention as he does. From beginning to close he writes of this recent journey in a cheerful strain. What he sees impresses him so favorably that he kindles in his reader a strong desire to set out at once on the

same journey. He begins with a description of the "Longest Railroad in the World," telling of how it was built, who were prominent in the movement, etc. Then he proceeds with the incidents of the journey. Once having reached the Archipelago in which we feel a special interest since he prefaces it with the pronoun "Our," he tells of all its natural features, making us hold our breath as perilous gorges, glaciers and canyons are described. He tells us of the government, the missions and the schools and, indeed, of whatever the reader might care to know. When Dr. Field was on his homeward journey he passed through a section then disturbed by strikers and he gives in this volume a chapter on "Strikes" which is most admirable. The illustrations are excellent and a helpful map is also included. The book is beautifully bound and we are sure it will have a host of readers who will read it through more than once.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Some valuable books, included in the following list, are reserved for notice in our next issue:

The Preacher and His Place. By David H. Greer, D. D. Charles Scribner's Sons.

An Outline of Systematic Theology. By E. H. Johnson, D. D. Am. Baptist Publication Society.

The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By Henry M. Baird. Two Vols. Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Way Out. A Solution of the Temperance Question. By Rev. Hugh Montgomery. Hunt & Eaton, New York; Cranston & Curts, Cincinnati.

The Christless Nations. By Bishop J. M. Thoburn, D. D. Same.

The Christian Literature Co. announces that the price of the Lutheran Commentary will be \$2 00 per volume after Dec. 1, 1895. Till that date it will be \$1.50.

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS.

Harper's Monthly for October is so full of valuable papers, bright stories, charming poems and fine illustrations that it is difficult to discriminate. Hindoo and Moslem is the title of the opening paper. Following it are papers on At the Sign of the Balsam Bough; Alone in China; Queen Victoria's Highland Home; The Gift of Story-Telling; Three Gringos in Central America; Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc; The Future in Relation to American Naval Power; The German Struggle for Liberty. The serial, Hearts Insurgent, grows in interest. Jamie the Kid and The Coupons of Fortune are two specially original stories. The Editor's Drawer is fuller than usual of bright and witty pen sketches and illustrations. It is a number that must be seen and read to be appreciated.

The October *Atlantic Monthly* contains the concluding chapters of A Singular Life. They are powerful, artistic and dramatic as has been

the entire story. Bradford Torrey's paper on Lookout Mountain is of peculiar interest on account of the memorable gathering there this Summer. Lafcadio Hearn contributes to this number another Japanese study and Mr. Peabody another paper. An Architect's Vacation tells of the Venetian Day. Susan Coolidge's paper, The Countess Potocka, and a paper of travel by Alvan F. Sanborn are unusually readable. The book reviews treat of a group of stories much discussed at present. It is an admirable number.

The Marriage Rate of College Women is a very suggestive article in the October *Century*. This same number contains a group of papers, celebrating the centenary of Keats who was born October 1795. Another group of papers relates to the career of Glave the Young African Explorer, who, after crossing Africa in the interest of *The Century* died on the 12th of May at the mouth of the Congo. Apropos of election times this number contains an entertaining paper, Fun on the Stump. It also contains the concluding chapters of Marion Crawford's Casa Braccio which has been filled with dramatic interest from beginning to end. How Men Become Tramps; Nordau's Degeneration; Prof. Sloane's Life of Bonaparte and An Earlier Manner are all papers more than worth the reading. Poems, stories, illustrations and editorial articles add to the charms of this closing number of the fiftieth volume and twenty-fifth year of *The Century Magazine*.

John J. á Becket contributes to the October number of *St. Nicholas* an appreciative sketch of "The Child-Painter, J. G. Brown, which is illustrated by reproductions of some of Mr. Brown's finest paintings. Surely every youthful reader will appreciate this paper. Following it are papers on James Russell Lowell; Lieutenant Cushing and the Ram "Albermarle" and The Manatee, Tapir, and Peccary. But we fancy the *St. Nicholas* editor thought that the young people who have just resumed their studies would prefer stories, poems, pictures, letters and puzzles and so this number as unusually full of what will prove pleasant diversion from study. *St. Nicholas* offers in this number a prize the terms of which all its readers will be anxious to find out.

The October number of *Table Talk* contains such valuable menus for the mouth that we wonder how any housekeeper does without these helpful hints. Tillie May Forney gives many useful suggestions for the Fall toilet. In the Replies to Housekeepers' Inquiries may be found many excellent recipes and ideas pertaining to the entertaining of guests. The papers are timely and all in all it is a number that should be found on the table of every well ordered Kitchen.

History of Zion's Lutheran Congregation of Newville, Pa., from 1795 to 1895. This is a centennial sermon delivered by the present pastor of the church, Rev. David Bittle Floyd, A. M., Sept. 1, 1895. The value of the pamphlet is in the historical matter here collated. The interest in it is enhanced by the manner in which this matter is presented.

Western Maryland R. R.

Mountain Scenery unsurpassed.

Good road bed.

Easy riding.

Well-furnished Coaches.

Courteous and obliging train hands.

